

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

A Quarterly Devoted to the Development of
Character through the Family, the Church,
the School and Other Community Agencies

APRIL, 1936



Church and State: Next Meeting of the R. E. A.

Hugh Hartshorne

The Religious Outlook

*Solomon B. Freehof, George A. Coe,
Max Schoen*

The Nature and Function of Religion

*William C. Bower, Stewart A. Cole,
H. Shelton Smith, Nevin C. Harner,
Isaac Landman, George A. Coe,
Theodore Gerald Soares*

Religious Education and the Present Scene

*Arthur E. Brenner, Erwin L. Shaver,
Ernest M. Best, Isaac Landman,
George A. Coe, Adelaide T. Case,
Hugh Hartshorne*

The Religious Education Association

Ernest J. Chave

By-Laws of the R. E. A.

Book Reviews and Notes

Religious Education

Seeks to present, on an adequate, scientific plane, those factors which make for improvement in religious and moral education. The journal does not defend particular points of view, contributors alone being responsible for opinions expressed in their articles. It gives its authors entire freedom of expression, without official endorsement of any sort.

Articles in *Religious Education* are indexed in the EDUCATION INDEX, which is on file in educational institutions and public libraries.

Membership in the Association is \$4.00 or more per year, of which \$3.50 is for subscription to the Journal. Single copies, \$1.00 each.

LAIRD T. HITES, Editor



EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

HEDLEY S. DIMOCK, *Dean, George Williams College, Chicago, Chairman.*

A. J. BRUMBAUGH, *Dean of the Students in the College, University of Chicago.*

E. J. CHAVE, *Associate Professor of Religious Education, University of Chicago.*

S. J. DUNCAN-CLARK, *Editorial Writer, Chicago Daily News.*

A. R. GILLILAND, *Professor of Psychology, Northwestern University.*

SOLOMON GOLDMAN, *Rabbi, Anshe Emet Congregation, Chicago.*

LAIRD T. HITES, *Professor of Psychology and Education, Central Y.M.C.A. College, Chicago.*

ELLAMAY HORAN, *Editor, Journal of Religious Education, and Professor of Education, DePaul University, Chicago.*

JOHN A. LAPP, *Author and Editor, Chicago.*

S. R. LOGAN, *Associate Superintendent of Schools, Winnetka, Illinois.*

FRANK M. MCKIBBEN, *Professor of Religious Education, Northwestern University.*

PHILIP L. SEMAN, *Director, Jewish People's Institute, Chicago.*

CLIFFORD R. SHAW, *Head of the Department of Research Sociology, Institute for Juvenile Research, Chicago.*

FREDERICK A. VIRKUS, *Publisher, Chicago.*

REGINA WESTCOTT WIEMAN, *Consulting Psychologist and Lecturer, Chicago.*

PAUL A. WITTY, *Professor of Educational Psychology, Northwestern University.*

The Religious Education Association

Publication Office, 404 N. Wesley Ave., Mount Morris, Ill.
Editorial Office, 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Illinois

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

VOLUME XXXI

APRIL, 1936

NUMBER 2

CONTENTS

	Page
CHURCH AND STATE	
The Next Meeting of the R. E. A.....	<i>Hugh Hartshorne</i> 82
THE RELIGIOUS OUTLOOK	
Let There Be Faith.....	<i>Solomon B. Freehof</i> 83
The Religious Outlook on the World Today.....	<i>George A. Coe</i> 85
Personality in an Unstable Society.....	<i>Max Schoen</i> 90
THE NATURE AND FUNCTION OF RELIGION	
Report of the Chicago Discussion Group.....	<i>William C. Bower</i> 95
Report of the Chester Discussion Group.....	<i>Stewart A. Cole</i> 100
Is Religious Naturalism Enough?.....	<i>H. Shelton Smith</i> 107
Some Meditations of a Personal Theist.....	<i>Nevin C. Harner</i> 111
Discussion of the Bower, Cole, and Smith Papers.....	<i>Isaac Landman and George A. Coe</i> 115
Personality Development and the God Experience.....	<i>Theodore G. Soares</i> 117
RELIGIOUS EDUCATION AND THE PRESENT SCENE	
What Kind of Religious Experience is Developing at the Present Time?.....	<i>Arthur B. Brenner</i> 122
How Effective is Religious Education in Meeting the Present Situation?.....	<i>Erwin L. Shaver</i> 129
What May Be Expected of Religious Education in the Present Scene: A Symposium.....	<i>Ernest M. Best, Isaac Landman, George A. Coé, Adelaide T. Case</i> 134
What May Be Expected of Religious Education in the Present Scene?.....	<i>Hugh Hartshorne</i> 139
THE RELIGIOUS EDUCATION ASSOCIATION	
Report of the Executive Committee to the Association.....	<i>Ernest J. Chave</i> 144
By-Laws of the Religious Education Association.....	145
Book Reviews and Notes.....	148

Application made for entry as second-class matter through the post office at Mount Morris, Illinois.

CHURCH AND STATE

The Next Meeting of the R. E. A.

HUGH HARTSHORNE*

AT THE Rochester meeting of the Religious Education Association, a year ago, the plan was adopted of focussing our work for a period of five years on the relations of personality and religion. The Pittsburgh conference, just held, represented the conclusions of a year of preliminary exploration in this field of study and eminently justified the decision to concentrate on a single group of problems. This meeting dealt more especially with the economic conditions affecting personality and with implications for religion and religious education.

Against the background of this conference, it was decided to move ahead on the general problem of personality in relation to religion and to take as the special area of investigation for the coming year the present and potential conflict between church and state. In the June, October, and January issues of *RELIGIOUS EDUCATION* several aspects of the problem will be canvassed. Regional groups of interested persons will be formed to study what religious educators might do towards meeting the issue. The 1937 Annual Convention will bring the results into a unified picture.

This proposal is particularly pertinent at the present time because of the tendency for national groups to dominate individual conscience and regiment social conduct. Fundamental ethical issues of deep concern to the religious view of life have arisen, and all sorts of cross currents of thought and practice require to be explored and brought out into the open if any clear course for religious education is to be plotted.

One thinks at once of the growing movement toward military training in schools, of teachers' oaths, of fascist tactics for the control of teaching, of federal assumptions of local prerogatives, of the lapse of democratic controls, of the drift toward international anarchy. What have we to learn on these issues from China, from Turkey, from Germany, Italy, Russia, and Mexico?

For some minds, the problem takes the form of the Supreme Court *vs.* the authority of some religious body. To others, it is the freedom of individual conscience that is threatened. Other aspects of this situation will occur to any reader, which will further illustrate the basic problems that bear on the integration of character and personality and on the discovery of a way to conserve the hope and promise of a religious outlook on the world.

The Association is a fellowship of members, not an agency of propaganda; and it is therefore earnestly desired, as we look forward to the conference of 1937, that a number of small groups here and there throughout the country will spend time during these coming months on the study and discussion of problems centering in this field of church and state relations. The more work we do as individuals and groups in anticipation of the 1937 meeting, the more fruitful it will be both for our thinking and for the cause of human freedom.

*President of the Religious Education Association.

THE RELIGIOUS OUTLOOK

LET THERE BE FAITH

SOLOMON B. FREEHOF*

THIS is a very frank Convention. It begins with an open confession—that we are all confused. Not that we are confused over the nature of childhood. Modern psychology has aided us greatly to understand children. Nor, primarily, are we confused as to the aims of religious education. In a general way we know what we are seeking. We are confused because we must educate children to fit into a modern world that is changing so rapidly as to leave us bewildered.

You must not think less of yourselves because you are confused. If you are frank you will admit that you *are* somewhat confused at the unstable modern world; not only you but also all your leaders in every field. Statesmen see basic laws and constitutions being questioned; economists see old laws of value and currency changed; students of international affairs see new violence and brutality arising to trouble the peace of nations. All of them are just as confused as we.

Seeking to grope our way out of the confusion we ask ourselves fundamental questions. May it not be that the ideals of education which we have hitherto cherished now need radical revision? May it not also be that children and youth whom we thought we understood

so well have changed under the impact of modern social instability so that we no longer understand them? A vital question confronts the Convention. How has the unstable modern world affected—if it has affected—the character, the ideal and the mood of those whom it is our duty to educate?

We can limit this vast problem quite easily. Young children are still comparatively unaffected. A child is sheltered. Parents protect it. The home is a sort of fortress. Whatever changes occur in the outside world are, at most, forces which work at a distance. But youth in the teens and in the early twenties is already within hearing of the artillery of the battle of modern life. Youth is in transition between the home and the world. Youth wants to know whether it will get a job; whether it will have a chance to practice a profession. Youth is worried. Some have been sadly battered by this ever-changing world. How has youth been changed in the modern world?

Immediately after the War we were all indignant at the older generation. We were scornful of the elder statesmen and elder leaders. We said they had dragged the world into that inferno of disaster. We demanded new influence and power for youth. We wanted young people to lead the world in business and in government. We have gotten what

*Rabbi of Rodef Sholom Temple, Pittsburgh.

we asked for. What have we achieved thereby? In Japan liberal statesmen are butchered by reactionary youth. The effective Japanese liberalism is discovered among the so-called "Elder Statesmen," while youth is organized for "patriotic government" by murder. In Germany the first strength of the Nazi Party was found in German youth organized as Storm Battalions. All over the modern world youth is violent, powerful and dominant—or is used for violence after being organized by violent leaders into docile, obedient masses. It is this docility, that de-individualizing of youth, this mass grouping of young people, which is terrifying. It is unnatural. Young people by nature are individualists. They think of their own career; they meditate; they commune with themselves, for this is the time when nature makes its last desperate attempt to convert us into individualities. Youth, more than any other age, belongs to itself. It is tragic to see the precious personality suppressed and youth, in many lands, pressed into a mass, goose-stepping to the command of a dictator.

We turn to America with considerable relief. Our youth, at least, is not over-organized into obedient masses. It is still more or less individual. Put it down to indifference if you will, but the fact remains that most of our young men are still free in spirit. But they, too, have been changed by the modern world. A recent writer, Maxine Davis, records the result of a visit she made all over the country, talking to young people at work, looking for work, in high schools and in colleges. Her description of American youth is that it is not in revolt. Youth is not protesting against anything. It is unemployed, but not indignant. It does not seem to care. American youth today is just "hanging around," waiting through the hours and days and months. It is just apathetic, waiting for something to turn up.

In Europe, in Japan, youth is sub-

servient; in America, youth is apathetic and listless. Both spiritual symptoms are aspects of the same ailment. It is precisely because the youth of Central Europe had despaired of its future and had lost its natural ambition that it yearned for a dictator to come and to give it some cause, in behalf of which it gladly gave up all personal individuality. American youth is also unnaturally devoid of youth's normal ambition, is today dull, unprotesting and apathetic. It is not yet a mass. It is waiting to become a mass. At present it is just a milling mob.

We are, of course, deeply dissatisfied with these changes which the modern world has made in youth. Can religious educators, entrusted with the development of character, do anything about it? We are not too certain. We know that the world is against us. In a world such as this it is difficult to teach the preciousness of personality and to restore faith in oneself and faith in one's future. Yet though the world is against us, nature is with us. The nature of youth wants to be personal and wants to be ambitious.

Not only nature but also our religious traditions are with us. All of us, Jews and Christians alike, believe in youth as something unique in the world. Jews in their Passover think of springtime, when the old earth brings forth its new carpet of green; and Christianity has its Easter message of the resurrection of every soul. We both believe that *society can renew itself only if we are able to make youth have faith in itself again.*

This is the central task for this Convention. It is for this reason that we of Pittsburgh are particularly eager to welcome the Religious Education Association. May its sessions prosper. May it convert its hopes into definite principles and its principles into pedagogy. We know our work will be blessed if we can teach youth, today living deep in the depths of despair, to lift up its eyes to the eternal hills.

THE RELIGIOUS OUTLOOK ON THE WORLD TODAY

GEORGE A. COE*

THE TOPIC is not of my choosing. I have been commandeered, and I obey. My first act of obedience is to wonder what should be understood by a "religious" outlook. If we study the trend of events in terms of profit-and-loss accounts, we have a business outlook. If we survey the prospects of this and that candidate and party, the result is a political outlook. In a similar way we might have an employment outlook, an art outlook, an educational outlook, and so on. Would a religious outlook be coordinate with these special outlooks? Business, politics, education, labor, and art are particular sorts of enterprise, each of which assumes to express a special interest. Is religion like this?

The historical and psychological study of religion has shown that it is not a particular sort of enterprise that rests upon a special interest; yet the daily practise of piety follows, on the whole, a contrary assumption. When one prays, one is not supposed to speak or feel as business man, laborer, politician, teacher, artist—the act of devotion appears to take place in an area apart from each and all of these. Religious duty is taken to be a particular kind of duty, religious feeling a particular kind of feeling, religious belief an independent process. Hence the progress or lack of progress in religion is commonly described by giving the statistics of church membership, attendance, and contributions. But religion is not an independent variable. Nor is business, science, or art an independent variable. Personality has not a compartmental structure. The "economic man" of yesterday's political economy is a mythical being, as all of us know.

Exactly so we now need to recognize that the "religious man" is an abstraction.

Religious beliefs have no segregated life of their own; never are they independent of ethical, political, and economic experience and thought. Religious conduct is not something over and above the working relations of human beings in families, neighborhoods, marts of merchandise, police stations, halls of legislation, coal mines and cotton fields, banks, bonds, unemployment, and doles. Our actual religion is not even injected into these relations; rather, these relations themselves embody our religion. If we are acquiescing in what is going on, this acquiescence is our actual religious attitude and practice; if we are seeking to change the current of events, then this seeking is our working religion. This does not mean, of course, that religion merely tags after society or passively reflects the environment. Rather, religion is like morals, art, and literature in that, while all of them grow out of the surrounding culture and reflect it, all of them select points of emphasis, and they may utter dissent.

In this complex of customary conduct that we call society what is there upon which the heart of today fixes as a value that is by all means to be achieved, and to what extent does life approach unity and harmony upon the basis of the value thus selected? The answer to this question is the outlook upon contemporary religion. We must observe actual conduct, and we must essay an interpretation of it. In this interpretation we must discriminate between what men think that they value and what their conduct proves that they do value.

Approaching contemporary life from this point of view, we come upon the following facts, problems, and interpretations:

First, we are heirs of a related set of faiths transmitted from ancient times under an assumption that here authority

*Professor of Religious Education (Retired), Teachers College, Columbia University.

resides, and that here is the true meaning of life—a meaning to which we must cling upon pain of losing everything that is worth while. Here are Holy Scriptures, a parallel tradition, and beliefs held to be vital, such as belief in a personal God. According to the ancient teaching, these contain the proper controls for individual and social conduct. Our present question is: Are these the actual controls? Do men choose this or that because the Bible tells them to do so? Do even members of churches and synagogues do it? I am far from assuming that men ought thus to choose; the sole question is, What do they choose, and why?

Now, can anyone doubt that nearly all current conduct reflects immediate grounds rather than the ancient authorities? If men recur to the Bible at all, they do so, as a rule, in order, by appropriate selection of quotations, to justify what on other grounds is already taking place or planned. Further, to what extent are the central articles of belief firmly held? The belief in God, for example? It certainly is true that in our own generation the generality of worshippers adore a God of peace in peace time and a God of war in war time. Further, prayer is less practiced than it was by our grandparents, and where it is practiced the content of it is materially changed. That is, even prayer and worship are partly under the control of something outside the transmitted faith. Moreover, not only is belief in the personality of God less general even among believers; not only is it openly doubted or denied; there is less sense of the nearness of God, however he be conceived. Finally, the conviction that there is any God at all except in some distant metaphysical sense seems to be growing less and less general. On the whole, human conduct, both within and beyond the circles that call themselves religious, is mainly controlled by forces that are not even named in what is called "the faith."

Second, sacredness is ascribed by "the faith" to ecclesiastical organizations.

This necessitates inquiry into the conduct of these bodies in the world today. Is their conduct controlled from within the faith that they transmit, or rather is it, like the already-described conduct of individuals, largely dominated by so-called secular influences? We Americans are tempted to think that the autonomy of churches in this country frees them from the secular control that exists in all state churches. We particularly look askance at Italy, with its division of power and interchange of support between state and church, and above all we abominate the Nazi theory of the totalitarian state—a theory that subordinates the church to political authority. But the degree of actual church autonomy is determined, not by a legal formula, but by the influences that mold ecclesiastical conduct. What does mold ecclesiastical conduct in the United States, then? I shall not attempt a general answer to this question; the limits of time do not permit this. I shall refer, rather, to a single point, but a crucial one.

How shall we explain the general tranquillity of church people in our generation with respect to the relation between church and state in the United States? Is there harmony between the ecclesiastical powers on the one hand and political authority on the other? Grounds for such harmony cannot be found in the accepted formulae of either Catholics, Protestants, or Jews; yet all seem to have found a comfortable *modus vivendi* with the state as it is today.

This *modus vivendi* with the state involves a relation with the economic powers that are back of the state. Protestantism, it has been proved, early incorporated into itself the extra-Christian ethics of capitalism. American Catholicism, besides explicitly supporting some of the root-principles of capitalism, seems to find nothing in the conduct of the state that is obnoxious except the secularizing of the public schools and refusal to intervene in the dispute between church and state in Mexico. But this religious tran-

quillity is paradoxical. In the country at large economic forces are at work curbing our civil liberties. Constitutional and statutory guarantees are being violated, often by officers of the law, occasionally by vigilantes, with no effective check by the courts. Every student of these phenomena is convinced that here we encounter a problem of the deepest significance for our civilization. But our civil liberties and our religious liberty are tied together historically and legally. The churches cannot retain their autonomy if they permit our civil liberties to perish. Yet no ecclesiastical body has taken alarm over its own peril.

The peril is immediate, not remote; for encroachments upon what the churches regard as their sphere have begun. In the Macintosh naturalization case the Supreme Court, in a majority opinion, said that we are a Christian people, holding ourselves obligated to obey the will of God, but that we must assume that the will of God is not violated by any act of the Congress when it declares war or requires citizens to take up arms. This says, about as plainly as a court could say it, that the Congress participates in interpreting the will of God for all citizens, and that this interpretation is final and not subject to review. This agrees surprisingly with Hitler's totalitarianism. Mr. Chief Justice Hughes in a dissenting opinion charged that the opinion of the majority of the Court subordinates duty to God to duty to the state, and he declared that this reverses a cherished principle and habit in American government.

Yet no ecclesiastical body has entered into a struggle with the state upon this point. Moreover, the situation was aggravated by the decision in the Hamilton and Reynolds case. For the new opinion quoted from the opinion in the Macintosh case the most drastic assertion of state authority. That is, one reason why a student's religious scruples against war and preparation for war need not be taken into account by a state university is the incipient totalitarianism that has crept

into law through court decisions. If Mr. Hughes and the liberal minority of the Supreme Court had again vigorously dissented from the totalitarian view of the state, our situation would be less portentous than it is. But, inasmuch as the Hamilton and Reynolds decision was by unanimous vote of the Court, the fear is justified that even the liberal members of our highest tribunal are moving in the direction of the fascist conception of religious liberty.

Inasmuch as ecclesiastical bodies are making no attempt to secure a reversal of these decisions, or to inaugurate a movement for amendment of the Constitution, the conclusion with respect to the conduct-controls of these institutions is parallel to the conclusion with respect to the main lines of individual conduct. These institutions, too, are under the control of forces that "the faith" does not recognize as legitimate.

Third, still pursuing the question, What do our people take as their supreme value, and to what extent are we approaching unity and harmony upon the basis thereof?—let us note that "the faith" that we have inherited connects the idea of the worthfulness of God with that of the worthfulness of man. If there is any religious conviction upon which we are agreed it is that of the sacredness of human life, particularly in the sense of the ultimate value of persons. What, then, is the outlook with respect to the value of persons? For answer we must consult the statistics of our war dead; the statistics of preventable sickness; the statistics of preventable accidents; the list of 73 laborers killed last year in our industrial conflicts. Beside all this, ordinary murders are insignificant.

This is only a fragment of the evidence concerning the place that persons have in our scale of values. We still have personality-stunting child labor, and it is growing; some five million youth from 16 to 25 years of age are neither continuing their schooling nor able to secure

work; 12 millions are unemployed; 20 millions at least are on relief.

These conditions make directly and inevitably for arresting the development of personality and for deterioration of any desirable personality that may have been achieved. As long as these conditions prevail, nothing—absolutely nothing—can counterbalance their effect. Nothing that the more fortunate parts of the populace can do will assure us a decent civilization—nothing unless it be vigorous measures to stamp out this monstrous inhumanity at its source. If we value persons we must stop relief for those who are able to work. That is, we must make relief unnecessary. Apart from natural calamities, there is no good reason why anybody who is able to work should not have productive, self-supporting work to do. To support our workers by taxation is an affront to their personality, and this is true of "made work" as well as of direct cash relief.

It is sometimes said that the real religion of America is faith in education. In our system of universal, free schools we have, indeed, shown respect for personality that approaches religious reverence. But see how our devotion to education is qualified and counteracted. There is no need to rehearse the curtailments that have taken place in our schools within the last five years, for you are familiar with the facts. What must be said, however, is that if the ultimate value of persons is a principle of religion, then the reduction of opportunity for education is anti-religious. Moreover, when educational processes that open the mind instead of closing it are distrusted; when oaths of loyalty are demanded of teachers; when "gag" laws are passed, and fear and suspicion prevent the frank approach of person to person, there, too, despite is done to religion.

Fourth, upon the monogamous family Judaism, Catholicism, and Protestantism unanimously insist. But even here the facts are disquieting. I refer not to the lusts of the flesh nor to other ordinary frailties; not to anything that better mar-

riage-and-divorce laws could remedy, but to an as yet relentless pressure against family life. Because of economic conditions, the age of marriage has been rising for some years. Under present unemployment conditions, further and indefinite postponement of marriage occurs with millions of our young people. Moreover, even if marriage were economically feasible for these young people, dwellings appropriate for family life would not be available. It need not be doubted that most of our people continue to assume the validity of monogamy; but here again the major *controls* of our situation are not in our good wishes but in the economic system. This system is undermining the monogamous family on a national scale.

Fifth. Well, then, what do Americans really believe in sufficiently to practice it? They have two such beliefs. First, they hold firmly, almost unanimously, to nationalism. They identify themselves with the political state, and to the state they attribute sovereignty. Sovereignty means, among other things, that in international affairs and many domestic affairs decisions for the whole people are made by a small group of officials at the national capital; that these decisions commonly rest upon what these officials conceive to be the national interest, not the general interest of mankind, and that the resources of the entire nation—material resources and man-power—can be commanded by this small group of officials in support of these decisions.

This involves the paradox of ordered life within the nation, but arbitrariness and potential anarchy among the nations. An eminent Christian minister has declared that modern nationalism is the chief rival of Christianity. But modern nationalism goes on as if such Christianity were non-existent. The country as a whole fears war, and abhorrence of it is growing; but fearing war is one thing, and controlling the national organs through which war is made is quite another. As yet, devotion to the nation in the sense of modern nationalism is char-

acteristic of our people. There is no other value except one with which so many of them are willing to go whithersoever it leads.

Sixth. The other sacred value of our people is private property. Our people are more touchy upon this subject than upon any other. For this reason it is appropriate that the angle of approach in what I am about to say should be clearly stated. I believe in private property because the control and use of material things is essential to the development of persons. Anyone who holds this point of view desires, not the abolition of private property, but the extension of it to all persons, and an increase in the amount available *per capita*. Property *for use*, that is; not property as an instrument for the coercion of others.

Though our people have not generally made the distinction between property for use and property for power, I cannot think that they are entirely mistaken in their almost unanimous feeling that private property is one of the basic values of human existence. But the general failure thus far to distinguish between property for use and property for power has great religious significance, namely, the lending of ethical and divine sanction to profit-taking and accumulation that have no value for the development of personality, but on the contrary involve the dehumanizing of masses of men and social disharmony. Even within churches whose transmitted faith commits them to the personality principle, property for power is as yet, on the whole, a sacred object.

These six items in our religious outlook have been named because they open difficult problems for religious education. Not all is problematical, of course. Religious people and institutions stand, and they will continue to stand, for refinement of life as against coarse satisfactions; for honesty as against fraud, theft, and robbery; for kindness in many relations, and for some sort of uplook towards what is regarded as divine. These we take for granted, and we do not under-

value them if we fix our eyes at this moment upon what is more anxiety-producing.

In summary, then, of our outlook thus understood, we behold these arresting facts: Though the adherents of our various religions are partly under the control of one or other inherited faith, they are still more under the control of contemporary forces that are not of the faith. Our ecclesiastical organizations likewise take on the color of their environment, and they are letting some of their most cherished prerogatives slip out of their hands into the hands of the state. Human life, though in words it is sacred, is not so in general practice. Personality is being thwarted, depressed, and distorted in millions upon millions of our people. The monogamic family is being undermined on a national scale. But devotion to the nation and to private property, not for use but for power, though they are not unanimous, are as yet characteristic of our people.

In the popular attitude towards nation and property there is an explanation for some of the paradoxes of our religious condition. Repeatedly we found that what is regarded as belonging to "the faith" is neutralized or positively counteracted by some influence that is unavowed or even unperceived. This influence we now can identify. The current of our economic and national life—primarily an economic life that takes the form of nationalism—flows through those of us who count ourselves religious as well as through those who do not do so. Moreover, this stream not only surrounds the specific acts that we call religious, it seeps also into these acts themselves, mingling a contemporary meaning and motivation with the historical deposit of faith.

What does this outlook portend as to the future of religion? This at least: That the future of religion is all one with the future of society, and that the future of society will be determined by what is done with nationalism and private property. The contribution that our historical

religions are to make to this basic problem is not yet clear. In ecclesiastical circles both conduct and thought are confused and self-contradictory. "The faith" that once was delivered is no longer an aggressive cause on behalf of which its adherents feel that they must risk their all. The only cause for which the average religious person is obviously willing to die is nationalism and private property for power.

Nevertheless, there are elements in the historic deposit of faith that are beginning to be used as a searchlight for revealing things that are hidden. In our ancient faiths there are strands of motivation likewise that, if they were disentangled, would convey power. There are ideas of God, and ideas of man, and con-

cepts of value that are nothing less than revolutionary. This a minority who still cling to the ancient faiths have perceived, and they realize that the problem for religion and for religious education in our day is all one with the problem of what to do with our economic order and our modern nationalism.

Here is a cloud, somewhat larger than a man's hand, that must be included in our religious outlook. If these revolutionary elements in the ancient faith should be brought into the foreground of religious consciousness, then, even though they cracked and split ecclesiastical institutions, our historical religions might wield a balance of power that would determine the type of future society.

PERSONALITY IN AN UNSTABLE SOCIETY

MAX SCHOEN*

MY THEME is personality in an unstable society, and my thesis is two-fold: *first*, that since a society is but an aggregate of individuals it follows that an unstable society is composed of unstable individuals, and that unstable individuals will make an unstable society. We have, therefore, the vicious circle that an unstable society will breed unstable individuals and these in turn will form an unstable society. *Second*, that since the Hebraic-Christian morality of supernatural authoritarianism has been the recognized moral code of the West for some nineteen centuries, supported by every moral and educational institution of society, and instilled into each generation by parents, teachers, preachers, reformers and magistrates, that moral code must be, in some degree, responsible for the instability that characterizes our social order and breeds unstable individuals.

That this moral code has failed to cure our social ills, even its staunchest champions will admit. Why has it failed? Because human beings will not follow it? Or because they follow it only too well? Since the former position has been held throughout the ages without solving our problem, it seems the part of wisdom to consider that the latter may possibly be the truer diagnosis. I shall discuss the problem from this standpoint: if a physician should hold that the failure of a medicine he prescribed to cure an ailment was due, not to the medicine but to the obstinacy of the patient, the physician would need treatment more than the patient.

My exposition has three parts: (1) a statement of the basic principles of the moral tradition of authoritarianism, (2) an analysis of the causes of its failure, (3) a proposal for a new outlook for the moral education of man, based upon verified principles of human nature. If my statements concerning authoritarianism seem extreme, it is because in the ex-

*Chairman of the Department of Psychology and Education, Carnegie Institute of Technology.

tremes we can more readily understand the harmful effects of the doctrine.

THE PRINCIPLES OF AUTHORITARIANISM

This morality holds, as its basic tenet, that the road to the moral life has been mapped out for man, and all he needs do is to follow directions to reach the moral goal in safety. The directions are marked "Thou shalt" and "Thou shalt not"; those reading "Thou shalt" leading to virtue and righteousness, those reading "Thou shalt not" leading to vice and unrighteousness. The road, directions, and rules for travel on this highway are not man-made, but were created by divine decree, handed down in some mysterious manner through divinely chosen human sources, and, as divine, they are infallible and immutable. To submit to these rules and to travel the road with becoming humility and submission is to attract divine favor and proper reward, while to refuse to do so, or to be diverted into by-paths, is to draw upon oneself justly merited divine wrath and punishment.

It is not only the privilege, but the duty of those to whom and through whom the law has been delivered, to teach it to man, to exhort him to follow the one path and avoid the other. As divine agents and emissaries, these individuals bear the responsibility of shepherds of the sheep. They may be exonerated in case the sheep stray from the fold, for the sheep have the choice of following or not following. Moses delivered the law, as instructed. His responsibility was performed when he told his charges that he had given them life and death, and urged them to choose life. If they failed to do so, the wrath of God was visited upon them, while Moses remained in divine favor, in a position to intercede for the stiff-necked people, and for issuing instructions as to the next move to be made.

Since the law is not of man's making, it is equally obligatory on all persons, permitting of no individual interpretation, and therefore calling for self-suppression whenever any tendency runs con-

trary to what has been decreed. If the suppression is not self-imposed, it constitutes deliberate violation of divine will, is a menace to group solidarity, and therefore calls for measures of retribution on the obstinate and willful. To be moral is conscientiously to conform and submit, to be immoral is deliberately to refuse. The individual is free only to choose to be moral or immoral, and if he chooses the latter he is to be driven to do that which he should do of his own choice. All individual tendency or inclination that runs contrary to the decree law is evil, and therefore self-suppression is virtue. And since the decree is an open book and instruction in it freely available, all evil doing is intentional.

Morality is subservience to law. To be moral is to do as others do, to be righteous, respectable. The good man is obedient, the evil man disobedient. Ignorance is no excuse, for even ignorance is a willful act of not wanting to find out what is good. Those who obey are morally obligated to seek out, reprimand and use their persuasive powers upon those who disobey, for by failing to do so they bring upon themselves the evils created by the disobedient.

But why is the law necessary? Because man, of his own accord, cannot discover the good, due to his natural depravity. Evil is his natural inclination, and he prefers evil to good. Because of his nature, evil is pleasant to him and good unpleasant. Of his own accord he would never discover the good, for even when it is revealed to him he must be induced by promises of rewards or threats of punishment to choose what is good and avoid what is evil. Therefore, to make man moral calls for injunction, indoctrination, compulsion, admonition, preaching, and warning. Without these procedures man would follow the easier and more pleasant road to evil and perdition.

THE FAILURE OF AUTHORITARIANISM

This outlook of traditional morality on man and his nature has in it the germ that

breeds the moral chaos of each generation, by defeating the sole purpose of any moral precept, which is the promotion of harmony in human relationships. It has this effect because it is a morality of dishonesty and a morality that creates and perpetuates the very evils it pretends to remedy.

The charge of dishonesty against the authoritarian moralist is based upon several counts. In the first place, while he pretends to face the battle front of morality, he is in reality retreating, even running away from it. He does this by rationalizing and justifying existing conditions in order not to face the fact that his precepts have failed. One piece of evidence that supports this charge is that the moralist is never willing to engage in a discussion or examination of the principles on which he is operating, claiming that there is no room for such an examination, in that his principles are of divine origin. This tends to indicate that he feels the weakness of his foundation, but refuses to admit it to himself.

Man resorts, therefore, to inventing good reasons for his failure by placing the responsibility upon human nature. Here he finds ready-made scapegoats either in the theological doctrine of natural depravity, or in pseudo-scientific theories of instinct and heredity. The trouble, he maintains, is not with the principles he advocates, but with human nature. Because of an event in the Garden of Eden, man prefers evil to good, in that evil is his natural state. Furthermore, man has his animal instincts and also evil traits inherited from his human ancestry, all of which make evil attractive and the good unattractive. Consequently, the sole means for making man moral, to steer him into the road of virtue, is by compulsion.

Another moral abscess engendered, countenanced, and even encouraged by authoritarianism is the substitution of precept for practice, words for deeds, resulting in lip-service and hypocrisy. It gives rise to two sets of virtues, those to

be proclaimed in public and those to be practiced in private. Under such a moral condition a man inevitably develops the delusion that just because he utters words, he becomes the sounds that issue from his lips. Conformity in words is easy, in acts it is difficult, but so long as there is conformity, the demands of authoritarianism are met and the moralist is satisfied.

This is moral insanity, and authoritarianism is its stimulating cause. Authoritarianism is responsible for the moral tragedy that human beings are afraid to give utterance to the real motives that actuate their behavior, afraid even to acknowledge such motives to themselves. Authoritarianism spells dishonesty with oneself, and inevitably dishonesty with others. The claim that this tragedy is inherent in human nature is disproved by every great moral personage in history, everyone of whom drew upon himself the condemnation of the moralist, just because he insisted and persisted in the practice of self-honesty and integrity. There is no room for this virtue in authoritarianism, since integrity can conform to no rule other than the law of its own inherent being.

This brief summary of the outlook of traditional morality and its fruits is the story of moral chaos and confusion. It bears these fruits because it is a morality of assumptions, of ignorance parading as divine knowledge, a morality that calls for driving instead of guiding, of indoctrinating instead of instructing. It is a morality of pretense, of delusion, of escape, of fear of facing realities, in brief, a morality of maladjustment. Its success means the creation of conflicts, of double standards. To be moral is to be thwarted, fretful, suspicious, secretive, evasive; in a word, to be unnatural.

This is our social madhouse, in which the maddest tend to become established in places of leadership as the sanest and in which the sanest are pronounced mad. Here we have the story of the conflicts in each generation between the rational minds who would guide their contem-

poraries to sanity and order, and the madmen who would parade as its protectors and benefactors.

Let me repeat: In this statement I am presenting the extreme point of view, recognizing, of course, that in most individuals authoritarian morality is not rigidly followed, but is tempered by the exigencies of living.

PRINCIPLES FOR MORAL GUIDANCE

The above analysis of the causes for the failure of traditional authoritarianism suggests the guiding principles for a new moral outlook if we wish to build stable personalities and a stable society. Traditional morality has failed because it violates human nature, biologically and psychologically.

Biologically, traditional morality violates the law of livingness. This law states that a living organism is a self-acting, self-directing, and self-determining body. These characteristics mark its livingness. It is self-acting in that a stimulus, whether inner or outer, does not determine its activities, but only sets it off to doing something, the specific nature of the activities being determined by the organism itself. It is not an outer conformer, but an inner-conforming body. When it is impelled to conform slavishly to the outer, traditional morality, it will develop some conflict, for where the natural cannot operate naturally it will do so unnaturally.

A living body, in the second place, is a self-directing body, and this follows necessarily from its being a self-acting body. As a self-acting body it seeks the stimuli for the gratification of its needs and selects those from among them that appear most desirable. Behavior is discriminating, selective, purposeful, tending to promote the welfare of the behaving body. From the point of view of moral action, this means that a living body invariably engages in acts which, at the time the acts are performed, satisfy a need of the organism, and are therefore good for it. In other words, no organism ever engages of its own choice in acts that tend

to destroy it. If the act later results in undesirable consequences, these consequences are not of the organism's choosing. All behavior is, in its inception, adaptive, never maladaptive. At any one moment, or under any one set of conditions, the organism does that which is best for it to do from the standpoint of its needs at the moment or under that particular set of conditions. The motive for all action is a search for the good at some one particular time.

What I am saying here is no more than giving a biological turn to the Socratic principle that there can be no such thing as intentional evil doing, that it is contrary to human nature to prefer evil to good. Only I would extend this to cover all living nature. The evil is a misconceived good, and a living body does not deliberately misconceive. Its misconception, or self-deception, or self-misdirection, is forced upon it by some abnormal conditions over which it has no control. The man who sets out to commit suicide does not do so because, in his opinion, it is bad for him, but because it is good for him, and it is his opinion that matters. And this opinion he did not deliberately set out to form. It was formed for him by circumstances not of his own making. An organism then, invariably directs itself into those channels of activity that offer the greatest promise to promote its livingness; and if its activities tend to lead to its destruction, it is an indication that it has been diverted from its normal or natural course of action by abnormal or unnatural conditions.

Thirdly, a living body is a self-determining body. This means that every living body is a system of self-determining laws, or is a law unto itself, and only the organism itself can know what is good for it or what is bad for it. We know this to be true in matters of food, and it is likewise true in anything else that pertains to its nature. If we want to know what is good for a living body we must consult that body, investigate its nature, and act accordingly. To preconceive what is good

for it or what it should be, is to start it on the way to destruction.

Such is an organism biologically. Let us now see what it is psychologically. This brings us to the human aspect of our topic.

For human beings the biological factors of self-action, self-direction and self-determination combine to give rise to a fourth factor, psychological in nature. We refer to the consciousness of selfhood, or the awareness of being a distinct and distinctive entity among other entities. This consciousness is a slow growth in knowledge. As the human being gets to know the world about him, he gets to know himself as being part of that world as well as being distinct from it. The knowledge of selfhood, therefore, undergoes the stages of all knowledge, namely, the sensory, the perceptual and the imaginative. An infant begins to be conscious of itself as a sensory self when its behavior shows a differentiation between its body and other bodies. It begins to be conscious of itself as a perceptual self when it begins to demand recognition from others as a distinctive self, and protests against being either ignored or imposed upon by others. It begins to show an imaginative self when its behavior becomes discriminating in terms of its own self, that is, when the present self is acting in terms of a prospective, or future self.

Thus the human animal knows itself as a self, as a self-acting, self-selecting and self-determining body, and all its activities are aimed at the fulfillment of its selfhood. The psychology of the normal personality is the self having found a sane, normal orientation in its world, while the psychology of the abnormal personality is this self lost in its world. And a stable society, or a harmonious, moral society, is a collection of individuals each of whom is a wholesome or integrated self, living at peace with itself and therefore at peace with other stable selves. An unstable, conflicting, immoral society, is a collection of individuals some of whom, or all of whom, are broken selves, in conflict with themselves, and therefore in

conflict with each other. When one cannot stand on his own feet he will attempt to use another's feet for his stamping ground.

These considerations as to the basic nature of the human material, biologically and psychologically, suggest the following guiding principles for sound moral instruction:

1. That the human personality is the sole and supreme value in the world, and the sole and supreme source of all good and evil. The good arises from a wholesome, sound, integrated personality, while the source of evil is a distorted, disintegrated personality. The abuse of the human personality, whether due to ignorance or deliberate exploitation, becomes, therefore, the only cardinal and unforgivable sin.

2. That human nature is basically and inherently good. The traditional outlook on humanity is incorrect in assuming that human beings know what is good, but because of their depraved nature, prefer evil.

3. That any principle or law intended as a guide for human life must be derived from human beings and be true to human nature. This means that if a principle calls for compulsion it is false. It means, furthermore, that the basis for a sound morality must be found in biology and psychology.

4. That in the modern world no valid distinction can be made between Jewish truth and Christian truth. Truth is truth, beauty is beauty, virtue is virtue, and goodness is goodness, irrespective of the religious labels that men might attach to them, and regardless of time and clime in which they function.

5. That today we have reliable knowledge about man and his affairs. Once this knowledge becomes common as a result of adequate instruction, both intellectual and emotional, human beings will begin to live the life that is worthy of human beings to live just because they are human beings, namely, the life of responsible, intelligent action.

THE NATURE AND FUNCTION OF RELIGION

REPORT OF THE CHICAGO DISCUSSION GROUP*

WILLIAM CLAYTON BOWER**

THE consideration of the different aspects of the problem of religious experience in an unstable world makes it clear that before we can become intelligent about our work or bring it to any conclusive result, we must clarify our minds as to the nature of religion and its functional relation to human experience. Otherwise we work blindly and uncertainly. Our understanding of the nature of personality and of the processes by which it is achieved, on the one hand, and of the nature and function of religion, on the other, are determinative of the procedures which must be employed if the resources of religion are to affect the interaction of the living human being with his world.

It was with a deep conviction as to the fundamental necessity of such a clarification that the Chicago group undertook to see whether such a preliminary formulation regarding the nature and function

of religion would be possible. Individual scholars in great number have published the results of their researches and conclusions in this field. But with one or two exceptions, no attempt has been made to ascertain whether a group of representative scholars could agree upon a fundamental body of concepts that would furnish at least a beginning of a working set of conclusions that might be made available for those who are engaged in the operations of religious education.

It was with these interests in mind that the personnel of the discussion group was chosen. The members of the Executive Committee who work professionally in the field of religious education constituted the nucleus of the group. The other members of the group were chosen from those who are engaged in the scientific or philosophical study of religion in the two larger universities of the Chicago Area, the University of Chicago and Northwestern University. Those who constituted the nucleus from the Executive Committee were Dr. E. J. Chave, of the University of Chicago, Dean Hedley S. Dimock, of George Williams College, Mr. Otto Mayer, Director of Research of the International Council of Religious Education, Dr. Frank M. McKibben, of Northwestern University, and the reporter, who served as the chairman of the group. Those who were engaged in the scientific and philosophical study of religion consisted of Dr. E. S. Ames, psychology and philosophy of religion, University of Chicago, Dr. C. S. Braden, history and

*At the request of the Program and Research Committee of the Religious Education Association, discussion groups were organized at various points to study the topic suggested by the heading of this section. Two groups, one at Chicago under the chairmanship of Professor Bower, and the other at Chester, Pennsylvania, under the chairmanship of Professor Cole, carried through. Their written statements, together with a critique of Professor Cole's paper by Professor Smith of Duke University, are included here as they were read on the floor of the Pittsburgh convention. Professor Harner's paper was written in the light of convention discussion; Professor Soares', several weeks before the Pittsburgh meetings.

**Professor of Religious Education, Divinity School of the University of Chicago.

philosophy of religion, Northwestern University, Dr. A. E. Haydon, history of religion, University of Chicago, Dr. H. N. Wieman, philosophy and psychology of religion, University of Chicago, and Dr. Regina W. Wieman, co-author with Dr. H. N. Wieman in the field of the psychology of religion and practicing psychiatrist. Dr. Louis L. Mann combined the scientific interest as a member of the faculty of the University of Chicago with the operative interest as rabbi of Sinai Temple.

Four meetings of the group were held. Interestingly, and to the surprise of the participants, the members of the group, after unhurried discussion, found themselves in substantial agreement on the basic concepts included in the formulation. No items were omitted because there was disagreement. Such differences as did appear were incidental and superficial, and were reconciled without great difficulty in the formulation herewith presented.

The group approached its task from the scientific as distinguished from the theological or ecclesiastical point of view. It was concerned to discover and state the function which religion serves in man's interaction with his world. The items which are included in the formulation are, therefore, generalizations to date based upon the mass of specific and concrete evidence afforded by more than three-quarters of a century of the scientific study of religion, especially as this evidence appears in the results of researches in the history and psychology of religion. This evidence is far from complete and much more research needs to be carried on in order further to verify these generalizations or to correct them. The formulation is, therefore, concerned with the ends which religion seems, in the light of this mass of evidence, to serve in the experience of persons and groups and not with the theological, philosophical, or ecclesiastical instruments by which the functions that serve these ends are carried on. In so far as the items in the formulation

are valid generalizations supported by evidence resulting from the objective observation and analysis of religious behavior they should account equally for the religious beliefs and practices of the fundamentalist and modernist, of the naturalist and supernaturalist, of the Christian and the Jew, of the Buddhist and the primitive. All of these groups, when their religious behavior is subjected to analysis, appear to be realizing the same functions in their experience by the use of their own particular beliefs and practices. It was the opinion of the group that not until generalizations, based upon such an analysis of religious behavior, are arrived at in terms of function can any valid scientific understanding of religion be arrived at. What, therefore, may appear to be "generalities" to those who miss specificity in the formulation are as a matter of fact generalizations based upon a mass of specific and concrete evidence derived from an objective study of religious behavior without which the specific beliefs and practices of any particular religion or of many particular religions leave us without insight into the nature and function of religion as a phase of man's interaction with his world.

The group was faced with the very difficult problem of the kind of formulation it should attempt to make. It was clearly recognized by the group that in the end any such formulation should be made available in non-technical terms which the practitioner and the layman could understand and use. But it was judged that in the interest of precision in meaning it would be advisable to cast the first formulation in the terminology which the technical scholar uses, leaving the translation of the earliest formulation into non-technical terminology to a later step. Consequently, the statement which is herewith presented is in technical language.

As to form of presentation, the group thought that it would be better to cast the formulation in terms of agreements in discussion rather than in terms of for-

mal definitions. What is herewith presented is, therefore, in terms of the points of agreement arising out of a process of co-operative thinking.

The formulation follows :

SUMMARY REGARDING THE NATURE AND FUNCTION OF RELIGION

As a result of discussions during several sessions, the group arrived at substantial agreement on the following items regarding the nature and function of religion :

1. That the religious quality of experience emerges in striving, consciously or unconsciously, for a unification of life involving devotion to an ideal elaborated through mutual adjustment and progressive integration of diverse, specific, and concrete goods of life. This quality generally emerges at points of tension in the interaction between man and his world, within a frame of reference of more inclusive relations felt to extend beyond immediate and specific experience.

2. That such a mutual adjustment and integration of interests and values is not to be thought of as something static, but involves a reaching out after ideal possibilities in experience.

3. That while with many persons and groups this process may assume the form of a continuous reconstruction of interests and values that are undergoing mutual adjustment and integration, it is also likely to occur in connection with emergent points of tension, and may be characterized by more or less sudden experiences, such as religious awakening at puberty, fresh insights into the wider meanings of a maturing and expanding personal and social experience, and the more or less sudden illuminations that arise out of experiences of crises.

4. That this mutual adjustment and integration of interests and values is not in practice usually achieved by conscious and reflective thought, but is in most cases accomplished by attachment and devotion to and participation in a cause that is capable of arousing the imagination,

evoking the emotions, releasing effort, and unifying the interests of life under its domination.

5. That it is through devotion to and responsible participation in a worthy cause that attention is likely to be focused, not so much upon self-worth as upon the ends sought. Since religion involves such devotion, it is in the free and effective functioning of the self with reference to ends rather than in self-regarding attitudes that the development of wholesome religious personality is most likely to be achieved.

6. That this progressive integration of values is developmental and is conditioned by maturation as well as by learning. Normally it should constitute a phase of the process of growth by which man matures.

7. That religion consists of a shared search for the satisfaction of needs, involving ideologies (that is, understanding of the objective reality), techniques, and institutional structures by which this search is instrumented and the ideal which embraces the values sought. While the ends sought by religious persons and groups are always realized in concrete and changing cultures, and are therefore subject to expansion, differentiation, and change in form, yet in their essential nature they are relatively persistent. On the other hand, the ideologies, techniques, and institutions of religion by which the question of these ends is instrumented are more immediately conditioned by the culture of the group and are therefore relatively much more subject to variation among different cultural groups and to sequential change in the developing culture of any given group.

8. A distinction is to be made between the static and the expansive forms of religion. The criteria of expansive religion are :

- The cross-criticism of values with a view to
 - Improving the mutual support of interests
 - Expanding their range

- b. Attempts to reconstruct the relations and functions of society in the light of such cross-criticism.
- c. The stimulation and release of intelligence and the use of the spirit and method of experimentation in the pursuit of values and in the reconstruction of religious practices, concepts, symbols, and institutions.

Because of this cross-criticism of values, this attempt at reconstruction, and this use of critical intelligence, it is one of the primary functions of expansive religion to create tensions between disparate values and the growing body of integrated values, on the one hand, and between an organization of values that tends to become static and its ideal possibilities, on the other. When these tensions do arise, expansive religion seeks their resolution in terms of a more complete orientation of life toward the forward-moving body of integrated values. The resolution of tensions is integrated with the body of progressively integrated values which, in turn, is enriched and expanded by the resolution of tensions. Expansive religion is thus not only hospitable to conflict, but induces in and grows by it.

9. Just as religious persons and groups in the past have instrumented this shared quest for the unification of life through the mutual adjustment and integration of interests and values by ideologies, techniques, and institutions which have grown up within the changing culture, so in the continuation of this quest under the changed and changing conditions of contemporary life, religious persons will continue to reconstruct the inherited ideologies, techniques, institutions, and ideals and to invent new ones that will more adequately further the process.

For example, as the concept of God has throughout the history of religion expressed the nature of reality as a frame of reference in which the mutual adjustment and integration of values has been achieved, so in the present and future God will continue to signify the real guardian of man's ideals, the guide of his

destiny, and the center of his loyalties.

So also, for example, prayer will continue to be employed as a technique for securing rapport with the reality that lies in and beyond the group and for utilizing the resources that reside in it, though it has been transformed from coercive magic and persuasion into an attempt to bring one's desires into harmony with the values that are believed to be operative in that reality.

So also, for example, the church will continue as the social structure that expresses the corporate nature of the continuing religious community and supports its functioning, though in its development it is transformed from a supernatural and authoritative ecclesiastical institution into a fellowship of like-minded persons who are bound together by a common body of ideals and by devotion to a common cause.

10. That a source of danger in religion to be guarded against is the tendency that arises with the accumulation of ideologies, techniques, and institutions, for religious persons to identify religion with its ideologies, techniques, and institutions rather than with the ends which they serve and to substitute the products of a past religious experience for the discovery and fulfilment of religious meanings and realization of values in man's contemporary interaction with his world of reality.

11. That in its functional relation to the present experience of living human beings religion is affirmative, positive, and forth-reaching toward the as-yet-unrealized possibilities of life in its ideal aspects rather than a backward-looking attempt to recover and reproduce the forms of religion that grew up within the various cultural media of the past.

The group feels that only a beginning has been made on a very important and very difficult undertaking. But as a result of this process of co-operative thinking, we have a definite statement which may serve as a basis for further elaboration, for further integration with other variant conclusions, and for discussion

with groups throughout the fellowship of the Association.

EMERGENT PROBLEMS

In the opinion of the group, there are several things that should follow this initial step:

1. Out of this formulation problems should be lifted for research. Some of these problems the group has itself suggested, as follows:

(a) The location of the points at which tensions arise in the interaction of growing persons with their world at the various levels of development, together with the forms which these tensions assume and the way in which different types of individuals experience them.

(b) A study of the ways in which religion has helped persons at the various levels of growth in resolving the tensions which they encounter in their interaction with their world.

(c) A study of the conditions that are favorable to the growing integration of values.

(d) A study of specific causes from the point of view of their relative contribution to the integration of values.

(e) A study of the relative advantages of focusing the attention of persons upon objective ends or processes as over against focusing attention inwardly upon the self.

(f) A study of the techniques by which the creative method of dealing with experience may be made effective among the masses rather than as at present among the relatively small group of intellectuals.

(g) An analysis of the factors in the modern world that are compelling change in the ideology, the techniques, and the institutions of religion, and of the ways in which religious groups are responding to these factors of change.

2. The possibility of translating this statement into non-technical terms needs to be explored. On first thought this may seem a relatively easy undertaking. On

second thought its immense difficulties appear. When these general terms are translated into concrete expressions which can be understood and used by the layman, they must inevitably be cast into the specific beliefs and practices that constitute the particular religious tradition within which the individual person or group lives. But as soon as the concrete ideologies, techniques, and institutional instruments are substituted for these general concepts, they cease to be the conveyors of universal meanings. This leads the group to suspect that the task of translation lies in the direction, not so much of a verbal statement, as of specific programs of religious education for specific cultural groups.

3. The development of techniques whereby these ideas can be made effective in the achievement of a religious quality of experience in the interaction of living human beings and living human groups with their world of reality. This, of course, involves the whole matter of a philosophy, a technique, and an organization of the processes of religious education.

4. The devising of procedures not yet known whereby these processes set forth in the formulation can be carried down from the level of the critical scholar to the masses who constitute our churches and synagogues and our communities, *on a creative level*. Some suggestion of what this process might involve is set forth by Professor Dewey in his *Liberalism and Social Action*. Some members of the group are in doubt as to whether the hierarchy of researcher, technician, and user, drawn from the field of technology, as suggested by Professor Dewey, offers the pattern on which this process may be worked out on a creative basis in which the many need to share in thinking as well as in utilization without reflection and valuing. Whatever the method of procedure, the group believes that this step constitutes our most necessary and difficult next undertaking in the field of religious education.

REPORT OF THE CHESTER DISCUSSION GROUP

The Church and Religious Naturalism

STEWART A. COLE*

HOW can the church help to recreate human society on a religious level? Men require the leavening spirit of religion to clarify and ennoble their everyday lot, but the Christian faith has never defined its purpose in terms of such an objective. For that matter, neither has the family, the school, government nor public health service. Each institution has sponsored a deserving cause and approximated the fulfillment of its purpose with a degree of merit. But, to conceive the well-being of man on a spiritual level and to enlist cultural groups in terms of this high interest, lies beyond society's range of commitment to date. Is this purpose practicable? If it be, how shall the church rethink its place and function?

THE PRINCIPLE OF RELIGIOUS NATURALISM

If man is to cultivate life on a religious level, a deeper issue than the rearrangement of the structural forces of human society is involved. Something more basic than the reawakening of personal loyalty to social institutions challenges. The question of a religious frame of reference presses for prior attention. What is meant by the phrase, "recreate human society on a religious level?" Are these words to be taken at their face value? If so, what is human society but the whole wide range of interlocking social and nature conditions that constitute the setting of contemporary man? They include family and farm, social cooperative and machine power, civics and livestock, credit and land, friendship circle and seasonal events, and much more. They form a milieu; that is, a vital pattern of social and cosmic forces in terms of which man lives from day to day and works out his

personal destiny. The milieu includes two comprehensive areas of interactivity: that between man and man and that between man and the extra-human economy. Jointly they may be considered as the realm of naturalism. What is naturalism but folk in their mundane setting together with the network of interactions that prevail between folk and setting in the process of human living?

In this orientation no reasonable human interest lies beyond the pale of religious significance. Regarding the welfare of children or cattle, engaging in a neighborly rôle or an engineering feat, meeting a social prejudice or economic adversity, eating and drinking or chanting and praying, a person may pitch every act in the religious key of significance. He does not characterize as religious a particular kind of event, but rather an eventful way of meeting any situation; not special rôles on stated occasions but a superior quality of achievement in every personal adjustment. This suggests a spiritual approach to living.¹ It makes for normal religious persons and wholesome community development. The whole gamut of human interests is supported by the religious motif when one considers recreating human society on a religious level. This viewpoint suggests the timeliness of the term, "religious naturalism."

The intent of this principle needs to be carefully examined, because religion is viewed in a natural setting that does not make it any the less genuinely spiritual. Indeed, in our age may not the natural order be recognized as the sphere of the spiritual? That is, we behave spiritually

1. Cp. John Dewey's expression, "the religious quality of experience," *A Common Faith*, (1934), p. 9; and George H. Mead's phrase, "the successful completion of the social process," *Mind, Self and Society*, (1934), pp. 273-76.

*Professor of Religious Education, Crozer Theological Seminary.

when we meet a life situation, involving the enlistment of the whole self, triumphantly. N. H. Wieman has struck this note in the following words:²

"We must insist that if the spiritual is to be found at all it must be found in and through the material. (The writer would say "the natural world"). The same senses that reveal the material must also reveal the spiritual. And in fact is that not very plainly the way we become cognizant of, say, other human minds which are spiritual entities, if the word spiritual has any significance at all? We do not mean to assert that the material is anything else than material. Neither do we mean that everything has both a material aspect and a spiritual aspect.

"There are material things which are wholly material and have nothing spiritual about them. In the same way we assert that oxygen is nothing but oxygen. It is not oxygen in one respect and water in another. But oxygen, when combined with other elements, makes water. So also material elements may be organized in such a way as to constitute the spiritual. And that does not make the spiritual dependent upon the material, but quite the contrary. When the material has been organized into a spiritual being, that being may be able to maintain itself. In fact, one unique character of mind is that it resists disintegration with more energy and ability than does matter which has not been integrated into mind. And what is more important, the whole material world, while not ceasing to be material, may in its totality, by reason of the form of its totality, constitute a mind."

What is the spiritual factor in human experience but high-minded personal adjustment to environment? It is ethically and aesthetically conditioned behavior. It arises whenever man meets man or man contacts nature and enriching kinship ensues. The spiritual needs to be divorced from ideas of "the spirit" and animistic phenomena.³ The occasion of spiritual awakening in a person has nothing particular to do with a special institution, place, time or tradition. Its activity is a more vital matter. A person acquires this re-creative orientation by learning how to meet advisedly the every-day, commonplace engagements of life.

"The spiritual will lose its vagueness if the degree of spiritual experience be made to vary directly with the varying richness of the experienced environment. A man is spiritual to

the degree in which he maintains relation with an environment that is comprehensive; he is spiritual not because his experience is illusive and emotional and mysterious, but because his environment is wide, and clear in its manifold distinctions.... the spirituality which man really knows is the spirituality of finite terrestrial lives. But it is precisely this spirituality which is appreciated by man to be of inestimable *intrinsic value*."⁴

Should the church desire to recreate human society on a religious level, this viewpoint provides the frame of reference for religion. When a man identifies himself with the improvement of the strain of his herd of cattle or when he associates with other workmen in an industrial process in such an understanding way that he fellowships therein a "working together" of all parties for deserving ends; when a woman enlists in domestic arts or community leadership and senses that she is contributing to high and abiding life values; when a youth fulfills zestful ambitions in projects that broaden the mind and enlist democratic loyalties; and when children discover in home, school, church and country-side increasingly expansive introductions into the meaning and worth of all things—these persons are forerunners of a spiritual society. In such social behavior they elevate human life to the religious level. That there are profound economic, political and ecclesiastical problems that thwart persons who attempt to live this way, is clear to everyone. These very problems, however acute or entrenched, present to the individual occasions for implementing the spiritual rôle of personality. Should he attempt to cultivate religion apart from social issues, he escapes spiritual realism and takes refuge in a wish-Confirming cult.

Religious naturalism provides a life setting in which man may actually have fellowship with God. He is not the God of the status quo, whether that of personal faith, social idealism or current Christianity. The God, who moves freely in the midst of man, is neither theologically circumscribed nor ecclesiastically fa-

2. H. N. Wieman, *Religious Experience and Scientific Method*, (1926), pp. 317-18.

3. Shailer Mathews, *The Growth of the Idea of God*, (1931), p. 187.

4. "Is Theism a Help to Social Service?" Martin Kaye, *International Journal of Ethics*, April, 1926, p. 303.

voristic. Where love is established, He abides; when justice is achieved, He shares; if faith springs true, He inspires; when persons turn from provincial appeals to human and humane causes, His Kingdom comes. God is natural; He expresses His genius in and through natural media. He works and man may work in terms of the same mundane forces and for the same high purposes. God is not to be thought of simply as the thrust of human ideals; that is the humanistic view. God is as objective in human experience as trees, parents, machines and sunlight are objective. He lives, and moves and has His being in the natural world, meeting man in the commonplace intersections of duty and privilege. A man fellowships God whenever he discovers spiritual resources through the discipline of meeting the exigencies of life happily and favorably. God is the participating and inspiring Other in every person-person or person-nature pattern of intercourse that eventuates in a fusion of superior values of living. God reveals himself in each spiritual experience, however humble or commonplace the occasions may be. Insofar as either a cup of cold water or a League of Nations releases, what William James referred to as, invisible, molecular, moral forces that sharpen the penetrating edge of social understanding, friendship or world peace, the spiritual becomes dominant in the human order. This is the realm of religious naturalism.

CHRISTIANITY AND RELIGIOUS NATURALISM

How does the principle of religious naturalism harmonize with the teachings of the Christian faith? No doubt that the Barthian, the Buchmanite, and many self-qualified "liberals" of the church would disagree forthright with the position presented here.⁵ Although these men inter-

pret Christianity variously, they would agree in saying that this particular religion rests soundly on supernatural fact. A natural faith could not be identified with the Christian evidences of the transcendental and the eternal.

Thus the issue is clearly drawn. It would be futile to attempt a short-cut compromise. The supernaturalist of whatever school of thought finds the key to religion in a revelation *from* Almighty God *to* morally impotent man.⁶ A natural religion claims that man, by living creatively, *can* share social intercourse with God and that there is no other technique for apprehending Him. One refers to intuition to account for human awareness of the divine; the other proceeds from sense experience, the senses that indicate friendship, justice, and purpose in human relations. The supernaturalist turns to a particular book, person or racial event for bona fide evidence of the intervention of the Eternal in Time and of the Savior-God in human history; the naturalist finds the redeeming God at work in the structural processes of the universe, the resource of goodwill in history, and the normal development of every child's personality.⁷ Not a few Christians discredit the claims of religious naturalism.

But this does not settle the matter. Upon what foundation does Christian transcendentalism rest? The viewpoint is rooted in history. The supernatural pattern owes its inception and long tenure in Protestantism to ancient thought-movements. There was a pre-supernaturalistic orientation of the Christian faith. This is not the occasion to trace the history of

1-9, and Henry P. Van Dusen, "The Faith of John Dewey," *Religion in Life*, Winter Number 1935, pp. 123-32.

6. Cp. William Adams Brown, *God at Work*, (1933); Ernest F. Scott, *The New Testament Idea of Revelation*, (1935).

7. This viewpoint is presented by Wieman and Wieman, *Normative Psychology of Religion*, (1935). Some of the force of John Dewey's criticism of Christianity in *A Common Faith* is misdirected, because he assumes too lightly that the "method of religion" which its advocates adopt is "supernaturalism." See especially pp. 39-40, 80.

5. Cp. the viewpoint of Niebuhr, Miller and Pauck, *The Church Against the World*, (1935); also the reactions to Dewey's naturalistic position in *A Common Faith* as presented by G. W. Buckham, "God and the Ideal," *Journal of Religion*, Jan., 1935, pp.

the church stage by stage in order to account for the present widespread endorsement of supernaturalism. Suffice it to say that when the early Christians adopted Hellenistic philosophy to interpret their redemptive experience, they became avowed exponents of a natural-supernatural basis of faith. Did not Paul and the early Apologists establish a firm foundation for this form of Christian dualism, which has maintained a dominance to our own day? The Jesus' tradition, on the other hand, and its Hebraic background reflect a very different approach to religion. Neither the Galilean nor his kinsmen sought Yahweh in a remote hinterland of the free spirit. In earliest nomadic times, in later tribal, pastoral and national stages of Hebrew development, and in the outlook of the peerless Hebrew Himself, the meaning and resources of religion were sought in the immediate habitat of the common man.

"Christianity at its outset was a nationalistic religion of redemption, distinctively Jewish in type. The figure of the redeemer, the notion of his special functions, and the definition of man's part in the program were all emphatically Jewish in character. . . .

"He (Paul) said, contrary to the views of the Palestinian Christians, that the age of legalism had passed away. He would no longer know either a Moses or a Jesus according to the flesh . . . the thing of which he is confident is that the secret of preparing proper inhabitants for the new kingdom lies in establishing a population of spirit-filled individuals."⁸

That is, the ancient Hebrew stream of this-worldly religion was spiritually deepened by Jesus and his Jewish disciples. But with the spectacular conversion of Paul and the apostolic resort to Hellenistic world-view, the stream was diverted from a mundane course into a supernaturalistic channel. Graphically, the deflection came when early Christians turned from the direct appeal of the person, Jesus, and his simple gospel of the good life to the Christ of apocalyptic source, meaning and status. Since it was assumed

that the resurrected Jesus had become an other-worldly Christ, the Christian Messiah transplanted the Man of Nazareth, Galilee and Calvary.⁹

Today this ancient frame of reference in Protestantism is challenged. While it is true that Paul's contact with Greek thought was considerably responsible for changing a Hebrew religion into a world faith, it is not necessary that we retain ancient or mediaeval thought-forms in order to commend Christianity to our age. Indeed, if we perpetuate this historic spirit, we shall seek a modern world-view to interpret our Christian faith. Historic and documentary inquiry accounts for Jesus naturally; that is, he entered life as every man enters life and of the same life-stream, played his superb spiritual rôle upon a local stage, and took his departure from the earthly scene under circumstances not unlike those that face every man. He is not to be explained in terms of a mysterious insert of supernatural power into a human instrument, but rather as the matchless prophet of a paternal God, the suffering servant of a redemptive cause, and the inspiring exemplar of the good life.¹⁰

Is there, then, a necessary conflict between the principle of religious naturalism and the Christian faith? If by the latter one means Hellenistic Christianity and its traditions, yes; if one refers to the faith of Jesus and his immediate protagonists, not at all. Indeed, they are of the same orientation. The viewpoint set forth here, compatible with the temper of our age, is a challenge from the *Weltanschauung* of Paulinism to Jesus' conception of the focus of religion in every-day human experience.

The full significance of this shift be-

9. This shift in the history of Christianity is traced by Gerald B. Smith, "The Christ of Faith and the Jesus of History," *American Journal of Theology*, (1914), pp. 521-44. Cp. Charles Guignebert, *Jesus*, (1933). In his epistles "Paul has deliberately sacrificed Jesus to Christ," p. 26.

10. Stewart G. Cole, "The Relevancy of Jesus," *The Journal of Religion*, July, 1935, pp. 281-293.

8. Shirley Jackson Case, *The Evolution of Early Christianity*, (1914), p. 339, 342; cp. B. W. Bacon, *Jesus and Paul*, (1921), Lecture III.

comes evident when Pauline teaching is compared with the viewpoint of Jesus concerning the major themes in religion. The latter identified himself with his people's historic heritage; the former disregarded the priority of historic forces and set up a mystical cult. The Nazarene sought to purify and advance the faith of his fathers; the Damascene centered man's confidence in a risen and transcendent Christ. Jesus said, "Repent and prepare for the reign of God on earth"; Paul pleaded for men to become "in Christ . . . new creatures" in anticipation of a divine Parousia.¹¹ The one grounded religion animistically "in the very nature of the universe and revealed in stones, burning bushes, thunder, fertility, harvest, the lily of the field, and the firmament of heaven. The most profound truths (of Jesus' teaching) abound in the forms of nature religion and the imagery of agricultural lore."¹² The other discriminated against "the world," the "natural body," "Christ after the flesh," and pitched religion in terms of "the spirit," "divine nature" (i.e., theized), and the absentee God who was "reconciling the world unto himself." In short, Jesus considered that religion was a rewarding way of living in terms of the immanent resources of the good life (focused in his view of God) that environed man, while Paul projected a faith in supernatural agencies as bearers to man of the grace of God. If contemporary Christianity follows the lead of Jesus, the Church *may* consider re-creating human society on a spiritual level.

THE SPIRITUAL FUNCTION OF THE CHURCH

A religion is presented for our times that may be characterized as Christian naturalism. That is, the religion of Jesus must be centered in this world-order, if Christianity is to inspire and assist in the transformation of our age. This is an-

other way of saying that it must focus faith in the activities of a realistic God. Since human society is the fairest child of cosmic forces, man may look for primary indices of this faith in social behavior. In other words, the field of the redemptive activity of God is the socio-cosmic process, those foci at which man in-relation-to man and in-conjunction-with cosmic resources works out his every-day salvation. While it is true that this age-old process has a graphic history, and that it climaxed once in the amazing achievement of Jesus of Nazareth, nevertheless for living man the spiritual drama centers in the present-day thrust of reality. A person must find the main source of religious support in the inherent spiritual possibilities of his own life setting. As the church commits itself to this cause, it will assume responsibility for a five-fold function.

First, *the church must acquire this natural orientation of religion.* This means nothing short of a new birth for the mind-structure of Protestantism. It must escape the entanglements of historic, supernaturalistic world-view and begin to take full account of spiritual values in matter-of-fact places. While men still look for a sign from heaven, God reveals Himself to struggling men in numberless matter-of-fact ways. He that hath eyes to see, let him see. But how can the people witness to His presence unless they have a pastoral interpreter? Insofar as churchly interests are pitched in terms of bibliolatry, Sabbatarianism, priestly ministrations or Christological mysticism, what hope is there for the Christian church? Protestantism requires a philosophy of common sense for its people.

Second, *The Church must become skilled in the art of spiritual guidance.* While there are many types of professional occupation to engage men today, the church has its own task in society. Not to lift the level of farming as such, not to arbitrate in family or industrial conflicts chiefly, not even to guide youth in vocational enlistments, are primary

11. Morton S. Enslin, *The Ethics of Paul*, (1930), pp. 237ff.

12. Stewart G. Cole, *op. cit.*, p. 285.

purposes of the Christian Church. Rather, it is the high calling of this fellowship to sensitize persons to spiritual possibilities amid the conditions of daily living. Mention has been made of the two broad areas of action in which man moves; the social and the extra-human orders. A situation in one of these will illustrate the principle of spiritual guidance.

Two years ago a complimentary banquet was held in an Ontario town in honor of the world's champion milk producer. Brampton Basilua, a five-year-old Jersey cow, occupied the center of the platform and received the recognition of five hundred guests, including leading dairy men throughout the Dominion of Canada. To impress more realistically upon these country dwellers the virtues of this patron saint of human health, around her stall were arranged scores upon scores of milk cans and butter tubs representing her year's production of nineteen thousand pounds of milk and thirteen hundred pounds of butter fat. Beside the plate of each guest was a glass of this cow's milk to be used in a toast to his benefactor. It is quite unnecessary to romanticize about an occasion of this kind or, with Gandhi and his Hindu kinsmen, to resort to animal worship, in order to find in the event a symbol of great spiritual import. The Mahatma has pointed out an intrinsic value of paramount significance to rural dwellers when he wrote in *Young India*:¹³

"Cow-protection is to me one of the most wonderful phenomena of human evolution. It takes the human being beyond his species Man, through the cow, is enjoined to realize his identity with all that lives. Why the cow was selected for apotheosis is obvious to me. The cow was in India the best companion. She was the giver of plenty. Not only did she give milk, but she also made agriculture possible She is the mother to millions of Indian mankind. Protection of the cow means protection of the whole dumb creation of God."

The American farmer may cultivate a natural and spiritual quality of experience as he appreciates fitly the animal which

13. *Young India*, October 6, 1921. Quoted by R. M. Gray and M. C. Parekh, *Mahatma Gandhi*, Second edition, pp. 102-03.

shares daily in his toil and provides him his most essential food. This orientation is in essence religion and suggests a religious way of living. Tennyson points to the same phenomenon in his "Flower in the Crannied Wall," and Wordsworth in "To the Cuckoo."¹⁴ It is a major responsibility of the church to teach its people how to approach ordinary conditions of the community in such a manner that extraordinary values may emerge. There is no duty, however painful, nor privilege, however plain, in the role of any person, that does not furnish the opportunity to touch intrinsic values of reality so intimately as to enhance the spiritual life. By these tokens man fellowships with God.

Third, the church must broaden the spiritual interests of youth and age to include all values that may enrich mankind. The church has no monopoly on the religious quality of life. When this institution becomes jealous of its prerogatives, it forthright loses them. When it spends itself awakening in every other institution and all cultural movements the fullest possibilities of the good life, it becomes man's invaluable instrument of religion.

"In the European Middle Ages, the spiritual power was the organized church, but what was then called religion was closely connected with learning and the arts. The church building in the mediaeval town or countryside was the center not only for worship or magic but also for dancing, music, and such painting or other arts as were available.

"The stadium or mediaeval university and schools, was part of the ecclesia. In the modern world what corresponds to the mediaeval church buildings is a whole group of separate 'cultural' buildings—theater, dance-halls, cinemas, art-galleries, museums, as well as schools and university buildings. Thus the spiritual power in our day includes all those

14. H. N. Wieman points out how man may be likewise sensitized through the contemplation of a penny and its remotest functional bearings, and Hugh Hartshorne uses the illustration of shelling peas. *The Wrestle of Religion with Truth*, (1927), p. 87f., *Character in Human Relations*, (1932), p. 252f., respectively. Cf. Michael Pupin's view of light, *The New Creation*, (1927), pp. 252-55. It is possible that Wieman and Hartshorne received the stimulus for their viewpoints from John Dewey. See his *Human Nature and Conduct*, (1922), pp. 262-63.

institutions which lift man out of the common round of habit."¹⁵

If this English writer were interpreting our American scene, he might include a wide variety of "cultural" movements that require spiritual interpretation. There is, for instance, the rural-urban conflict of minds and the necessity of reconciling certain values in order that both parties may share a higher religious heritage. The spiritual implication of the new trade pact between the United States and Canada is a case in point to whet the imagination of a church bent upon leading its people into broader ranges of loyalty to the good life. Such a function of the church does not in any sense make it a confirmer of the status quo nor a political partisan in world issues; rather it helps men to rise above all pacts and parties, sit in judgment upon them, appraise them in terms of man's highest values, and thus emancipate him for adventure in more rewarding ways of living than are yet standardized in statute law or social habit. It is the church's obligation to entertain as broad an interest in persons as God gives people the wherewithal to acquire well-being.

Fourth, *the church must assimilate deserving values of the times with the finest ideals of historic Christianity.* This is one of the most urgent and least inviting tasks to which Christian leaders will have to address themselves.¹⁶ There are on the one hand, such imperishable symbols of our historic faith as Jesus, the Cross, Christ, grace, sin, redemption, God, Providence, love, and so on; and on the other hand, there are the factors in contemporary experience to which we attach the highest significance, such as personal character, secular idealism, the spirit of science, economic security, child welfare, world peace. What is the bearing of his-

toric Christian ideals upon current life values? Must men not learn to associate them directly in a deeper meaning and worth of Christianity or split their personalities into conforming shreds, one part paying lips service to God in the chanting of ancient liturgies and the other part centering upon the art of living well? What bearing has the Bible upon a man's investment in nature's property? In particular, is there a vital relation between the Mosaic law or the Sermon on the Mount and the lot of cotton or corn growers? Whence the moral sanctions of industry, of neighborliness, of world-mindedness? Do they reside in the teachings of Jesus of Nazareth, or in the divine urgency of problem-situations themselves that face living men constantly? If in the latter, then what is the place of Jesus and the purpose of Christology in the pattern of social behavior?

Finally, *the church must provide persons the opportunity to join in a fellowship-worship of God.* This is its highest function. Religion essentially is God-centered, whether those who participate in spiritual questing are aware of it or not. The activity of God in human affairs and in the on-going socio-cosmic process is not dependent upon man's awareness of it. He forever works at those intersections of reality where the good life is becoming the better life and where the latter is yielding to the challenge of still higher levels of human endeavor. While it is not essential that a man sense God's presence in order to enjoy His providence, he would enter more intelligently into his spiritual birthright if he learned to recognize the behavior of God and to fellowship Him in the worship experience. Indeed, the very act of worship itself, when purposefully participated in, may bring the worshipper a spiritual quickening which ennobles his lot and expands the Kingdom of God. As the church acquires a natural Christian faith and dramatizes this faith in the worship service, it will help to recreate human society on a religious level.

15. C. Delisle Burns, "The Spiritual Power and Democracy," *International Journal of Ethics*, XL, 1929, p. 3.

16. It is the most neglected subject in the literature of religious education. This is one of the chief criticisms to be brought against the Wiemans in *Normative Psychology of Religion*, (1935).

IS RELIGIOUS NATURALISM ENOUGH?*

H. SHELTON SMITH**

THE PROBLEM of vitalizing the teaching process resolves itself ultimately into the problem of discovering a vital religion. The most basic factor in the rise of liberal religious education in America was the emergence of liberal Christianity. Liberal religious culture having captured the Protestant churches, a process of communicating this new culture became necessary. Hence, the immense popularity of religious education during the twentieth century. To the mass of people, of course, religious education meant simply a new way of imparting an old religion. Actually, however, it meant nothing less than the rise of a reconstructed religion.

Once more, our culture is undergoing fundamental change, and with it organized religion is thrown into crisis. Thus it is not merely appropriate, but imperative, for religious educationists to re-examine the nature of religion in relation to modern culture. For it is the basic assumption of this paper that religious education is rooted in an unrealistic religion. Preoccupation with technic only reveals the inadequacy of our religious philosophy of life. Religious educators must find a more dynamic religion for the emerging age, or resign themselves to the inevitable eclipse of their movement in the American churches.

Professor Cole's paper faces this problem in clear and candid fashion. He frankly and courageously advances the view that the only kind of religion adequate for the new day is religious naturalism. His presentation falls logically into two parts. In part one he undertakes to show that religious naturalism, as he interprets it, is grounded in the tradition of Jesus as opposed to that of Paul. In part two, he

develops in detail the nature and the function of religious naturalism.

According to Professor Cole, religious naturalism roots itself in "the ancient Hebrew stream of this-worldly religion." Jesus, he maintains, perpetuated this tradition of a "this-worldly" religion. "Neither the Galilean nor his kinsmen sought Yahweh in a remote hinterland of the free spirit . . . the meaning and resource of religion were sought in the immediate habitat of the common man."

But a *bête noir* crept into this Jesus tradition of the "simple gospel of the good life," in the form of Hellenistic supernaturalism. With the conversion of Paul, "the stream was diverted from a mundane course into a supernaturalistic channel." Thus he holds that the supernatural is really alien to the religion of Jesus. "The viewpoint set forth here . . . is a challenge from the *Weltanschauung* of Paulinism to Jesus' conception of the focus of religion in every-day human experience."

As a matter of historic fact, I find Professor Cole's contention at this point highly questionable. In the first place, Hebrew culture from its earliest beginnings was saturated with supernaturalism. Dean Shirley Jackson Case, whom Professor Cole quotes as a principal authority, says: "Supernaturalism runs like a scarlet thread through the whole book [Bible] from Genesis to Revelation."

To remove the supernatural from Jewish culture would be to rob it of its center of gravity. Israel's philosophy of history is cast in the mold of supernaturalism, without which the whole idea of a "Chosen People" falls to the ground. The call of Abraham, the Promised Land, the Burning Bush, the giving of the Ten Commandments, Manna in the Wilderness, the deliverance from the Egyptian

*A critical review of Professor Stewart G. Cole's paper, entitled "The Church and Religious Naturalism."

**Professor of Religious Education, Duke University.

1. *Experience with the Supernatural in Early Christian Times* (1929), Preface.

bondage, the Babylonian Exile—to such events the Jew could only give an emphatic supernaturalist interpretation.

The world-view of the eight-century prophets is not less super-natural than that of the early Hebrews. Believers in social justice though they were, they nevertheless orientated it in terms of a God whose day of judgment, as well as whose day of grace and deliverance, was founded in supernatural action.

The Palestinian Jews of Jesus' time were also devoted supernaturalists, although not given to the crasser forms of magic and superstition. "It would be a grave error," says Dean Case, "to imagine that Jewish religionists in the time of Jesus had any thought of abandoning supernaturalism for what the modern world might call an imperically based attack upon the problems of life and conduct."²

Thus it is most improbable that Jesus could have inherited anything from the Jewish tradition but supernatural religion. Not only so, but recent New Testament scholarship supports the thesis that Jesus held the current apocalyptic and eschatological views of his age.³ In a recent article, Professor McCown says: "The fact that Jesus and the early Christians were of the apocalyptic faith, that they expected some kind of a divine intervention in the affairs of the world within a short time, will not be denied by anyone who has considered the evidence."⁴ More conservative liberal scholars, such

as the late Dr. Benjamin Bacon, go so far as to say that Jesus regarded himself as fulfilling the mission of the Danielic Son-of-Man. "Without a Son-of-Man doctrine," says Bacon, "the faith itself could not possibly have survived the first shock of disaster."⁵

To be sure, Hellenism did introduce into the Christian movement certain supernatural forms. But this was only adding Greek supernaturalism to Jewish supernaturalism. It is important to note, moreover, that whatever influence was wielded in this age in the direction of naturalizing religion, came, not from Jewish sources, but from such Gentile forces as Stoicism and Epicureanism. To quote Dean Case once more, "the Gentiles were much more keenly aware than were the Jews of the rights which naturalism might claim as its own."⁶

In summary, (1) Jesus himself was rooted in a Jewish tradition decidedly supernatural in outlook; (2) New Testament scholarship supports the thesis that Jesus himself held the apocalyptic and eschatological views current among Palestinian Jews; (3) although Hellenism contributed a part of the supernatural stream that fed the waters of early Christian culture, Gentile influence did more than any other force in early Christianity to obtain consideration among religionists for naturalism as a world-view: Thus it is untrue to historic fact to say that the religion of Jesus was diverted into an "other-worldly" faith under the influence of Pauline Hellenism. From both the Jewish and the Gentile sources, Christianity partook of supernaturalism. Unless one tortures words and movements out of all reason, one cannot squeeze early Christianity into the secular image of religious naturalism.

So much for historical consideration. We may now look at the nature and merits of religious naturalism as envisaged by Professor Cole. Within the limi-

2. *op. cit.*, p. 10.

3. Harvie Branscomb, *The Teachings of Jesus* (1931), chs. 8, 9.

D. R. Bultmann, *Jesus and the Word* (1934), chs. 1, 2.

W. E. Bundy, *The Religion of Jesus* (1928), ch. 2.

Shirley Jackson Case, *The Evolution of Early Christianity* (1914).

E. F. Scott, *The Kingdom of God*, (1931), ch. 2.

Maurice Goguel, *The Life of Jesus* (1932), ch. 21.

J. Warschauer, *The Historical Life of Christ*, (1927), ch. 5.

4. C. C. McCown, "The Eschatology of Jesus Reconsidered," *The Journal of Religion*, January, 1936, p. 39.

5. *The Story of Jesus* (1927), p. 267. See also Bacon's *Jesus and Paul*, p. 57.

6. *op. cit.*, p. 11.

tations of this review, only some of the more basic issues can be discussed in the remainder of this paper.

In the first place, Professor Cole unreservedly rejects the idea of salvation in terms of transcendent revelation, grace, and deliverance. "Jesus," he tells us in his paper, "considered that religion was a rewarding way of living in terms of the imminent resources of the good life . . . while Paul projected a faith in supernatural agencies as bearers to man of the grace of God." "The supernaturalist . . . finds the key to religion in a revelation from Almighty God to morally impotent man. A natural religion claims that man by living creatively can share social intercourse with God."

In support of natural salvation, Professor Cole goes on to tell us how Jesus, before the Pauline deflection, preached "his simple gospel of the good life," free from all transcendentalism. He says further that Jesus "entered life as every man enters life and of the same life stream, played his superb role upon the local stage, and took his departure from the earthly scene under circumstances not unlike those that face every man." Like all devotees of the liberal Jesus, he concentrates upon the Jesus of history, a Jesus who, as teacher-prophet, went about doing good, and who chose the way of the cross as an example of heroic action. The Pauline conception of God as being "in Christ reconciling the world unto himself" is, he holds, alien to the modern mind. In short, he repudiates the idea of salvation as Divine deliverance in the medium of Christ. For a gospel of good news in Christ, he substitutes a gospel of good works.

In thus making salvation center in good works, Professor Cole reduces Christian salvation to a scheme of "living creatively." On this basis the church becomes one more agency of social reform, and a minor one at that. Mind you, the objection here is not to the social objective of Christianity. Rather, because the social objective is so imperative for the

contemporary church, Christianity must be approached from a higher plane than that of human social activism. The objection lies in the realm of the essential nature of Christian salvation. Christian salvation is fundamentally a divine-human process, not something man achieves merely by moralistic means. The weakness of the Social Gospel lay not in its social objective, but rather in its moralistic strategy of Christian salvation.⁷

Now the assumption of most religious naturalists is that a transcendental type of religion cuts the nerve of ethical effort; that when one depends upon a divine source of deliverance, one ceases to devote himself to mundane interests; that those whose eyes are fixed on the eternal, lose realistic perception for the temporal matters of ethical reconstruction. Such assumptions, however, skew the facts of religious history. Upon the contrary, only high religion with a redemptive cross at its center has afforded society its revolutionary gospel. Eighteenth century England offers an illustration here. The rationalist movement to emancipate man in terms of ethical anthropocentric salvation failed. The Evangelical gospel of salvation through reconciliation to God in the event Jesus Christ, came to the rescue of a decadent age. Although our present-day objective will be collective in its approach to modern culture, the demands made upon social units will be in terms of salvation through a redemptive deliverance, not in terms of moralistic self-salvation.

Another feature of Professor Cole's theory of religious naturalism concerns the nature of religious experience. "The religion of Jesus," says Professor Cole, "must be centered in this world-order." Although he reminds us toward the close of his discussion that "religion is essentially God-centered," he says, "He (God) lives, and moves and has his being in the natural world, meeting man in the commonplace intersections of duty and privi-

7. See H. R. Niebuhr, "The Attack upon the Social Gospel," *Religion in Life*, 1936, p. 180.

lege . . . God is the participating and inspiring Other in every person-person or person-nature pattern of intercourse that eventuates in a fusion of superior values." "Where love is established, he abides; when justice is achieved, he shares; . . . when persons turn from provincial appeals to human and humane causes, his Kingdom comes." "In this orientation no reasonable human interest lies beyond the pale of religious significance. Regarding the welfare of children or cattle, engaging in a neighborly role or an engineering feat, meeting a social prejudice or economic adversity, eating and drinking or chanting and praying, a person may pitch every act in the religious key of significance. He does not characterize as religious a particular kind of event, but rather an eventful way of meeting any situation."

The import of these statements is that religion operates within the whole matrix of social life; that God is found here or not at all; that life as a whole is potentially spiritual; and that every act may be spiritualized through a qualitative adjustment. Now I take it that no one would wish to say that religion should be restricted to a particular segment or function of life. As a transcendent and transvaluational experience, religion must be relevant to all of life or else relevant to none of life. It may be assumed also that Divine Reality confronts one in the total scheme of individual and social relations.

The issue for us lies deeper. One aspect of it is this: What makes a given unit of experience religious? Professor Cole tells us that being religious involves not a particular kind of event, but rather "an eventful way of meeting any situation." He in this connection quotes with approval Dewey's phrase, "the religious quality of experience," and Mead's "the successful completion of the social process." He then assures us that "a person may pitch every act on the religious key of significance." When, however, he proceeds to show what the criterion of a religious or spiritual act is, he leaves the

reviewer very much mystified. We are told that a person behaves spiritually when the whole self is enlisted in meeting a life-situation triumphantly. But what is meant by "triumphantly"? In another, that the spiritual factor in human experience is high-minded personal adjustment to environment. But what is "high-minded" adjustment? In still another, that it is ethically and aesthetically conditioned behavior. What is "ethically and aesthetically conditioned behavior"? Again, he says the spiritual factor "arises whenever man meets man or man contacts nature and enriching kinship ensues." What is "enriching kinship"? In a longer statement, he says, "When a man identifies himself with the improvement of the strain of his herd of cattle or when he associates with other workmen in an industrial process in such an understanding way that he fellowships therein a 'working together' of all parties for deserving ends; when a woman enlists in domestic arts or community leadership and senses that she is contributing to high and abiding life values; when a youth fulfills zestful ambitions in projects that broaden the mind and enlist democratic loyalties, and when children discover in home, school, church and countryside increasingly expansive introductions into the meaning and worth of all things—these persons are harbingers of a spiritual society." Here again, one is forced to ask, what is meant by such phrases as "deserving ends," "high and abiding life values," "democratic loyalties"?

What, specifically, then, makes experience spiritual or religious? I repeat, I am left wandering about in the vaguest sort of verbal wilderness. This, of course, is a most difficult question to answer. And it is a difficulty that all approaches to religion in terms of valuational processes confront. We are told that religion adds no new values of its own, but instead is a revaluational or transvaluational aspect of all experience. But one still is left with the problem of determining the key to what constitutes the "religious

quality of experience." Hence, religious subjectivism lurks in all value theories of religion.

Moreover, this emphasis upon religious experience as potentially present in all life-activities, carries other dangers besides that of religious subjectivism. In a subtle fashion, it may lead, albeit unconsciously, to the secularization of religious values. Religion being but a "superior quality of achievement in every personal adjustment," secularization may occur by equating religious experience with sentimental trivialities. Or it may occur by the tacit assumption that inasmuch as all values are potentially religious, any human event may be equally enriching to religious experience.

The same subtle process of secularizing high religious values may be encouraged through what is called "lifting" values onto a religious plane. Much is said about "spiritualizing" values through their reorganization or idealization. Thus Professor Cole becomes romantic over the religious values that resided in the

exhibition of the world's champion milk producer. Such an act, he tells us, is "a symbol of great spiritual import."

It may be. But it is also a reminder of an ever-present danger. It is the danger that we shall secularize the spiritual. Can one spiritualize secular values by "lifting" them to a so-called higher plane? Let the secular be valued as the secular. For example, money-making is money-making. The secular profit-motive will not be transmuted into a perfect spiritual motive by an equal distribution of the profits. After all, "man does not live by bread alone," no matter how much we "lift" the activities of bread making. And if we proceed under the assumption that it does, then we secularize high religious values under the guise of spiritualizing them. The net result, in this event, is that the more we spiritualize American culture, the more denatured Christianity will become. How to keep high religion alive, and how at the same time to keep it relevant to a dynamic society, is the perennial problem of mankind.

SOME MEDITATIONS OF A PERSONAL THEIST

NEVIN C. HARNER*

THE following reflections were suggested by the discussion at the Pittsburgh convention of the question, "What is the Nature and Function of Religion?" That discussion was a most fruitful and stimulating one. Many in the audience were literally and figuratively sitting on the edges of their chairs throughout the afternoon. The topic was probably pursued further in numerous automobiles en route for home—as it certainly was in ours. Out of it all have come certain queries and formulations which may be viewed as the *confessio fidei* of a rather

non-philosophical believer in a personal God.

I am considerably bothered by the attempts at the convention to define the nature of religion. I do not mean that I am irritated, but genuinely disturbed. For example, Professor Bower's committee agreed: "That the religious quality of experience emerges in striving consciously or unconsciously for a unification of life involving devotion to an ideal elaborated through mutual adjustment and progressive integration of diverse, specific, and concrete goods of life. This quality generally emerges at points of tension in the interaction between man and his world, within a frame of reference of more in-

*Professor of Christian Education, Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church in the U.S., Lancaster, Pennsylvania.

clusive relations felt to extend beyond immediate and specific experience." Note that they say that the religious quality of experience generally emerges at points of tension. Suppose it does—what of it? Many other qualities of experience also emerge at points of tension. For example, intelligence comes into play at just such points. And anger! How, then, are you going to tell which is religion, and which is intelligence, and which is anger?

There is no doubt at all that you say something important about the religious quality of experience when you affirm that it emerges at points of tension. You *describe* it, but do you *define* it? . . . I wonder if there is much gain in trying to define the religious quality of experience in terms of the circumstances under which it emerges.

Or, take the way in which Professor Cole defined the religious quality of experience. As I understood him, he said that any unit of experience is religious when the whole man adjusts to the whole range of his environment on the highest possible level. . . . That seems to get me into trouble again. The distinction between the religious and the irreligious would then be a matter of degree. If a man responded to 57% of the relevant stimuli in any unit of experience, he might be irreligious. If he rose to 58%, he might be religious. The distinction between the religious and the irreligious would seem to be, therefore, a quantitative matter. . . . How much gain is there in trying to define the religious quality of experience in terms of the quality or quantity of adjustment arrived at in the experience?

Would it be a grievous error to define it in terms of *the content of the consciousness of the experiencer*? What would be wrong with saying that an experience is religious *if* the experiencer at that moment has a cosmic or metaphysical reference in his consciousness, or—in the traditional language of religion—if he thinks of God at the time of and in connection with his experience? For example, my

friend and I according to this criterion might be engaged side by side in the same piece of social work, and one of us might be behaving religiously and the other irreligiously. We might be marching side by side in a Peace Parade. If he thought as he marched that this parade was of significance to the cosmos (avoiding for the moment the language of personal theism), and that the cosmos in the long run supported peace parades rather than war parades, then he would be acting religiously. If on the other hand I did my marching without any such conscious reference of the experience, or even believing steadfastly that there was no extra-human support for a peace parade, then I would be acting irreligiously. A by-stander could not tell for the life of him which of us was religious and which was irreligious.

Of course, this is the old-time way of defining religion, but that does not invalidate it necessarily. There is, however, a real difficulty in such a definition, which I am forced to recognize. It runs the risk of making religion morally indifferent. From time immemorial people have done things which were morally bad, but they called their acts religious because they performed them with this metaphysical or cosmic reference in their consciousness. Some say that has been the great trouble with the church. It has defined the religious quality of experience in terms which have not guaranteed its ethical content. Good church-people have persecuted their neighbors and fought their enemies and thought of themselves as being highly religious all the time, just because the idea or thought of God was flitting about harmlessly in their consciousness all the while. . . . I suppose there is something to this. To come back to the example of the peace parade again but this time with certain changes in the picture—my friend might combine with his conscious cosmic reference a tremendous selfishness while he was marching. In such a case he would not be truly adjusted to his fellows or to the cosmos at all. He would be like the son in the biblical para-

ble who said "I go" but went not. On the other hand, I might be doing my marching in true adjustment with my fellows and with a cosmic drift toward higher values for all of my refusal consciously to relate myself with the cosmos. I would then be like the other son who said "I go not" but actually went.

And yet—it is only the thought of a morally indifferent God which can be morally indifferent in its effects. I must not be so easily frightened away from locating the differentia of a religious experience in the consciousness of the experiencer. A clear-cut notion of God or the cosmos, arrived at in and through social as well as nature experience, can not be irrelevant to the adjustment patterns of a man's life.

Perhaps it is true, as some say, that the person who acts on a plane of high adjustment to reality but has no cosmic reference in his consciousness could be said to be implicitly religious, while the person who adds the cosmic reference could be said to be explicitly religious. I see no objection to that. . . And yet, when all is said and done, the explicitly religious person is better off. He has an undergirding for his life that the other person does not. He will do more good and have more hope in the doing of it than the merely implicitly religious person. Else, what is consciousness for? In such a case I would have to turn behaviorist tomorrow!

* * * *

I wonder what would be wrong with taking Professor Cole's system of religious naturalism and grafting a personal theism upon it. One would be saying then that through contacts with the social and the extra-human environment, as through a medium, the worshipper establishes rapport with a personal God.

I know that if I were saying this before the Pittsburgh convention I would be challenged immediately to define what I mean by the word "personal." Well, what do I mean? I suppose I mean that the Reality with which a religious person gets in contact is at least as high in the

scale of being as I am. That does not seem to be an unreasonable assumption. The truth of the matter is that I simply cannot conceive of Reality being on a lower plane of existence than myself. I think it was Walter Marshall Horton who stressed the point in an article some years ago that such a view forces the universe to bring forth something higher than itself.

But I still have not defined what the word "personal" means to me. I am a person; and I can think and love and purpose. Whatever else "personal" does or does not mean, it means those things. Is it an unreasonable hypothesis that the Reality which I approach through contacts with the social and the extra-human environment can think and love and purpose just as I can? . . . Now, let me be clear—am I saying "think" and "love" and "purpose" in quotation marks, to indicate that I am ascribing to Reality something different from human thinking and loving and purposing? . . . No, I do not want any quotation marks. Why cannot Reality think and love and purpose just as I can? By saying this I am not insisting that He thinks, loves, and purposes exactly as I do, but if His thinking, loving, and purposing differ from mine they go beyond me rather than fall beneath me. They differ in the direction of the supra-personal rather than in the direction of the subpersonal.

My naturalist friends would say, "Where in the cosmos does this personal God of yours reside? Is He apart from the cosmos, or is He in and through rocks and stones and atoms and human beings? And if He is in rocks and stones and atoms and human beings, how can He come to a focus so as to be able to think, love, and purpose?" . . . Well, I am in my body—whatever "I" am. I am in its nerves and bones and finger-nails. And yet I come to a focus, somehow or other. I feel myself to be a self-conscious unit of existence. I can think through problems and care for my children and plan new ventures tomorrow. If I can do it,

why cannot God? Bone and finger-nail are as crassly material as the everlasting hills! He is in His body, the cosmos, but He is He, and not merely a set of principles, or a nexus of laws, or a widely diffused energy, or a conglomeration of objects, or a sub-personal structure of reality. That seems at least as reasonable as its opposite.

Does such a view bring back the old outmoded supernaturalism of the pre-scientific era? Well, it certainly is not my intention at least to bring back a *miraculous* supernaturalism. I want to have nothing to do with a separate layer of reality behind the phenomenal world which can get at me chiefly by a detour around the phenomenal world and with which I can get in touch in the same way. I want no miracles, no ecstasies, no mystic visions. Just as my only medium for communicating with my friends is my body, so God's only medium for communicating with me is His body, the cosmos. I will not look for Him elsewhere. I will look for Him—and find Him—in my social and natural environment. Everything will thus become sacramental. Sunset and evening star, the flower in the crannied wall, my friends and servants in the animal realm, my fellow human-beings, the long struggle of mankind toward justice, the scientific formulations of physics and psychology—all of these will be touched with religious significance, because they are the media through which a Person is manifesting Himself.

Does such a view bring back the old dualism between mind and matter? I do not know! It would scarcely be criminal if it did. I do not have to be a monist, although I would rather be one if I could. . . . My friends, the naturalists, say that mind is not a separate category of being

but is merely a function of matter. (It is just possible that it is the other way around.) But suppose for the time being that they are right. That part of my good friend, then, which converses and fellowships with me is merely a function of his material body. . . . Very well! If I can meet with as satisfactory and intelligent and responsive a Function of the material cosmos as greets me in the material body of my friend, I can afford to lay on the shelf for a while the metaphysical question of What it is that I meet with.

* * * *

What crucial issues lie before our Association during the next decade? . . . We are a Religious Education Association. It requires three words to describe us. The last of the three need give us no concern. We are now a true association. There is a real fellowship binding us together. How often it was mentioned and abundantly exemplified at the Pittsburgh convention! The second of the three words probably does not present to us our chief issues. We know a good bit about education—more in fact than we can get put into practice during the next ten years. It may be that it is upon the first word that our attention should be fixed. We are of different minds as to what the word "Religious" in our title means.

Unless we can conserve a wealth of distinctive meaning for this word, we shall forfeit part of our reason for existence. And, furthermore, we shall probably play squarely into the hands of the Barthians. The immediate religious future of America is in the hands of the conservatives unless a genuine religious warmth can be conserved within the framework of liberalism. There is nothing to prevent this from being done! . . . Can we do it?

DISCUSSION OF THE BOWER, COLE AND SMITH PAPERS*

RABBI ISAAC LANDMAN

I HESITATE to enter a discussion that is distinctively Christian and theological, but perhaps I can say something which would be explanatory and helpful.

In Christian naturalism, as presented by Dr. Cole, I fail to find an answer to the question, What does *God* mean? In the category of Christian symbols that Dr. Cole gave, God came fifth or sixth or seventh in the list. He did what I would have done—made clear the distinction between the religion of Jesus and the religion of Paul. The religion of Jesus came from the religious concepts of the Pharisees. Jesus in his beliefs and in his approach to religious concepts was a pupil of the Pharisaic rabbis. These teachers find no distinction whatever between the holy and the profane, or between the religious and the secular, and this was the religion of Jesus. In that point Dr. Cole seems to me accurate in his interpretation.

There seems to me, however, no question but that Dr. Smith's criticism is correct: namely, that Jesus tied up all of his religious ideals directly with God *in a supernatural sense*. The difficulty appears, I think, when the modern Christian, skilled in the Christianity which confuses the religion of Jesus with the religion of Paul, interprets supernaturalism in the sense of Paul rather than in terms of the Pharisees and of Jesus.

Jesus was—(I do not know what term to use because I am always very careful in speaking to Christians about Jesus)—impregnated with the thought of God just as much as any of the prophets preceding him. It is surprising to me that Dr. Cole does not recognize what has seemed to me in my study of Jesus so clear; namely,

his consciousness of the personal Deity, not in the sense of the Pauline theology, but in the prophetic sense of the Pharisaic tradition.

Amos—who undoubtedly is the greatest of the prophets—was the one who caught first the spirit that religion is a socialized function. When he declared in that famous passage in opposition to the cult, that what God requires is only justice and righteousness, they challenged him. "What are you talking about?" he replied, "Shall two walk together except they have agreed?" meaning definitely, "Could I speak in the name of God if God did not speak to me?" Jeremiah is another of the prophets who felt the personal God within him. He tried to run away from God and found that God followed him, so he conceives of him as genuinely personal. Jeremiah spoke of the God experience within him as a fire within his bones.

Jesus had similar experiences of Deity. I think you cannot make the distinction which Dr. Cole makes and rest upon the continuous flow of the stream of religion from the prophets, if you fail to recognize the concept of a personal Deity in the religion of Jesus of Nazareth.

There is an inherent human urge which impels man to seek and to find his relationship to the universe. Jesus found it in the phrase of his own Pharisaic teachers, "Our father who art in heaven." Religion is the organized force that conserves the present religious experience of men from which their future experience will evolve. I think that was what Jesus felt when he went out to teach. He was building upon the Pharisees' teachings of his day. Like the prophets, he was revolting against the set cult and other things which were not in line with prophetic religion. As I have suggested, there are two elements in this prophetic tradition, one of which Dr. Cole

*At the request of the Chairman, Rabbi Landman and Professor Coe closed the Friday afternoon session of the convention with brief comments upon the three papers read. Their comments are so apropos that they are reported here as taken by the stenographer.

has underestimated: first, human relationship to the universe, behind which is Deity; and second, the translation of re-

lationships into works of justice and righteousness, which is social service today.

PROFESSOR COE

I am so intensely interested in the *particulars* of life that I do not feel quite at home in a discussion of this sort. There are twenty million people on relief. I wish these twenty million were right here to listen to this discussion. Unless we have something that these people can appreciate, something that we can say to them, that will make them respect a broken-down religion, then we had better keep silent. I was reared in the sort of religion which Professor Smith described. I saw it break down every single time. Nobody seems to have raised the question of whether any kind of religion has succeeded or failed to succeed. The kind of religion Professor Smith has described has had a long trial. It has had time enough and opportunity enough to show what it can do. We know it has failed already.

It is easy to talk about these things in high generalizations—atonement, salvation by faith instead of works, and all that kind of thing—I do not know what it means particularly. I do not see the fruitage. It has broken down in Germany. It has broken down in the United States. I think I am in line with some of the greatest teachers when I say “*By their fruits ye shall know them.*”

I am very much stirred by the particular mention by Professor Cole of the cow, something that feeds the hungry. A great teacher for whom I have profound reverence said something about feeding the hungry. He evidently had cows in mind.

I was taught to go to the communion, to the Lord's table at which we partook of

bread and wine. We ate and drank, and I was taught that somehow in that eating and drinking of the symbolical bread and the symbolical wine, we made real to ourselves in our thinking and feeling our participation in the life of God. But I seem to have learned later that the Eucharist had its origin not in symbolical eating but in literal eating, in communal eating. Jesus apparently never commanded anything such as the Eucharist has become. Various forces focalizing in the Apostle Paul gave it a meaning they supposed it should have, but which did not come from Jesus and which I do not think he had in mind. This meaning came from the religious practices around about, such as the mystery religions. These mystery religions had a Eucharist. They served symbolical food and symbolical wine. We know also that eating and drinking in the mystery religions was a precipitate of a long process which emerged from communal eating when food belonged to everybody. Symbolical eating came to have some relationship to participation in the life of God.

This will show how far I feel from being at home at this moment. If we had a table of the Lord which actually *fed the hungry of this world*, if we could all sit as equals enjoying the resources of this world, as common sons of God, I would partake of that communion. I have ceased to partake of the symbolical communion. I will not commune again until I can commune as an equal with those who are hungry.

PERSONALITY DEVELOPMENT AND THE GOD EXPERIENCE

THEODORE GERALD SOARES*

WHAT is the God experience? Perhaps it may be defined by contrast. An eloquent speaker was developing the thesis that man, having been misled through the ages by supernaturalism, should now emancipate himself and learn to look realistically at the world. Abandoning all sense of relation to personal forces more than human, man should concentrate his attention upon a corporate quest for the good life. The final impression left upon the hearer was that human folk should consider themselves as orphans flung by blind fate upon an inhospitable planet, where instead of fighting one another in a struggle for existence they should learn to be brothers, seeking after the best until the grim destiny that awaits us all should end the striving.

That is the opposite of the God experience. One can see that it would conduce to a certain type of personality. It could produce Henley's *Invictis*; it might lead to the social purpose and passion which the speaker was urging, indeed many of the socially most alert personalities of our time share this outlook. On the other hand the kind of God experience which was expressed in the heaven and hell motive or in the blind faith that everything happens for the best might produce only apathy in the presence of glaring social evils.

But our question is not whether personality can develop without God (we might need a hundred years to be sure of that) or whether personality can be warped by an unreal God, but whether an experience of God such as a modern philosophy could warrant, an experience which to many of us is our surest contact with reality, is fitted to be an element in the achievement of character.

Consider the two hundred inch telescope. It will carry us unimaginably

farther into the depths of space than any human research has yet gone. Of course it will not take us any nearer to God; indeed some will tell us that it will only make clearer the insignificance of man. Harry Elmer Barnes has said, "astronomically man is negligible," to which George Albert Coe has replied, "Astronomically man is the astronomer." Hartley Burt Alexander has reminded us that the gift of "the octave of vision," that brief aperture of light between the red and the violet, between the frequency too low and the frequency too high for us to sense, has introduced us to the stars. We might have been animals that could see sufficiently to get about, a condition that would have been economically adequate, but we have been given light and we can walk among the nebulae. Earth born though we be our experience of light makes us inhabitants of the universe. Now if we take a personal attitude toward this gift of light, that is receive it as God's way of admitting us to be sharers of the light, we have not only escaped the grim destiny of insignificance but we have achieved the blessedness of being at home with the Supreme Reality. As we behold the glory of the stars or the beauty of the flowers we are in truth in communion with God. We have accepted sight as God's invitation to live with him who covereth himself with light as with a garment.

It is not the old supernaturalism that God made the world in the beginning, still less the barren deism of a "Great First Cause." Our modern science saves us from that, for it is not concerned with a world that was made but with one that is being made. It is not a construction but an activity. The paper on which I write and the solid desk which supports it are not quiet as they seem but whirring activities of unimaginable velocity. We are not in a universe that was made but amid energies that are going on. Perhaps Schop-

*Professor of Ethics, California Institute of Technology.

enhauer was right, that the nearest understanding of the universe possible to us is the experience of will. Modern physics makes his insight far more significant. We seem to be in the midst of a stupendous, never ceasing exercise of will. Again then are we constrained to take nature personally, and the experience of nature becomes a communion with God—not a God who once made things but a God who now wills things.

The influence of this experience on personality development is the sense of congruity between our human nature and the cosmic purpose. We are not the chance creatures of fate for we share the prerogative of will which is the all-creative energy. And more than that we find that the cosmic will is intelligent and intelligible. We discover that the universe is a thought process, and the cosmic thinking is also our thinking. Doubtless the objection may be made that we have imposed our thought upon the universe, that having made a rational accommodation of our experience of the external world with our own rational process, we have simply assumed the objectivity of that process. But our scientific success has been too satisfactory for any such explanation; the response of a thousand tests has been too uniform. When we think wrong the cosmic process corrects us and when we think cosmically we know that we are right. So again we take nature personally, and indeed morally, and believe with Kepler that "we think the thoughts of God after him."

Some scientists would object. I remember that I once used the expression "search for truth" in conversation with a very eminent biologist. He at once corrected me, "Do not say truth but fact; science is concerned with the discovery of fact." I venture to disagree with him; and I have a right to do so for he was not then talking science but philosophy. That man cannot work in his laboratory without inevitably using moral terms. One conclusion is true, another is false; one experiment is right, another is wrong;

one method of investigation is good, another is bad. Fact is the way the intelligent will of the universe works, which is the same as truth.

Perhaps it is a pity that we ever learned to talk of "the laws of nature." They have sometimes seemed to be rules imposed upon nature by the "Great First Cause" or else they have seemed an impersonal, inevitability of nature going on its way with machine like regularity. But nature as the free expression of a rational moral will is far more illuminative of what we experience in the scientific enterprise; impartial but not impersonal, for thought is not impersonal; and the reality of the universe is thought, and the way of that thought is truth.

A personal attitude toward the universe as true would seem to be very different from a mere understanding of "the laws of nature." A little girl studying arithmetic noted a statement in her text book that the answer to a problem was either right or wrong and that it could not be partly right. She objected, pointing out that one might have the right method but by a mistake reach the wrong answer. Her father asked her if she could partly catch a train, if the sun could partly rise in the morning, if the promise of a bicycle which he had made to her could be partly fulfilled. He tried to point out that we live in a world of truth, that nature never lies, and that the experience of truth is communion with God. He was feeling for a personality development out of the arithmetic experience raised to the religious level.

It was once said of Huxley that in his scientific research he followed the facts with a devotion to truth that was almost religious. Why not leave out the limiting adverb? Huxley's protest against the crass supernaturalism of his time estranged him from the explicit religious attitude but under more favorable conditions he might not have objected to the view that experience of truth is communion with God; he might have been willing to find in a deeper naturalism the God experi-

ence. At all events to many of us nature seems to be an intelligent moral creative will in whom "we live and move and have our being." With wonder and awe we enter into the great fellowship. We find ourselves purified by the very privilege of knowing the ways of God, we feel the obligation of a commanding truth in the presence of a process that never deceives us, we think we have achieved some development of personality in this experience of the God who ever wills the world.

Does this seem to be an outmoded use of the word truth, and have we forgotten that the invariability of nature is only statistical average, and may the principle of indeterminacy upset our whole argument? Rather these show only the more clearly that we are not in the presence of blind forces but of intelligent moral will. An English teacher of physics in a secondary school recently said that he would like to be free from any requirement to teach classical physics, believing that even young people could learn the difference between appearance and reality and learn to be at home in a world of energy and relativity. They would not find the truth of a static order laid down but the more vital truth of a world ever forming itself into new patterns of achievement. If God is thinking out his on-going world with freedom, even with experiment, how exhilarating to be in some sense sharers in the great cosmic enterprise.

We have said that nature never lies. There is, of course, one most serious exception to this statement, namely human nature. Man is part of nature but he does not share in the reliability of nature. Trees, rocks, stars tell the truth but man does not. The tree promises that if we will fulfil certain conditions it will produce an orange; and it does. The rock agrees under certain definite circumstances to hold up a building; and it does. The star tells us that if we do thus and so it will show us what it is made of; and it does. But man promises to do thus and so if he is elected to public

office; and he does not fulfil the promise. Why does nature fail when it becomes human? If there was a moral will working in the evolutionary process, how does the result become immoral in man? On the mechanistic theory there is no difficulty, but we have been upholding a view of the cosmic process as thought and moral purpose. It seems to fall down just when it would become most significant. The answer to this difficulty must lie in the conception of values. When the evolutionary process reached the human level, values appeared; but there cannot be values without the possibility of choosing the lower and refusing the higher. The politician wants re-election, profit, power, more than he wants honor, so he forgoes the value of truth. The ambitious man wants success more than he wants art, music, literature, so he forgoes the value of beauty. The sensualist wants exciting experiences more than he wants health, purity, the honor of woman, so he gives up the value of goodness.

As the betrayal of values is the tragedy of the human race so devotion to values is its glory. A woman turned aside from the joys of youth and the happiness of love, from the thousand allurements of life's pleasantness, that she might give herself with unremitting care to a study that should decide whether cancer is hereditary. She gave up everything for truth and human welfare. An artist with the fire of creation felt that he must write the music that was singing in his soul. Poverty and neglect could not daunt him for he would surrender everything for beauty. A man of honor refused the way of wealth and success for they were offered at the price of compromise with right: he left all for goodness.

A picket frozen on duty—
A mother starved for her brood—
Socrates drinking the hemlock,
And Jesus on the rood;
And millions who, humble and nameless,
The straight hard pathway trod—
Some call it Consecration,
And others call it God.

We may say that man in his long struggle on the earth has beaten out through bitter experience these values for which the noblest live. Strange product of the jungle! Perhaps such values are too young and tender to endure. The world may find that truth, beauty, and goodness are not worth having in comparison with power, wealth, and lust. We brethren in the night may lose our courage and join the cry of defeat, *sauve qui peut*. The human values tossed up in our rude history may be lost again. Whatever of personality development were possible would then be without the values—if that is thinkable.

But if the values are in the very nature of things; if we may take the personal attitude toward them and feel Truth speaking to us, and Beauty calling us, and Goodness demanding our allegiance, then we know that the values cannot be lost and that we must live for them. The experience of values would then be communion with God. The incarnation is the supreme religious concept: "the Word became flesh." The moral quality of the universe is in humanity. That which found its fullness and climax in Jesus is present in all human life. When I seek after the great values it is God in me that is seeking. The Stoic told his disciples that he was part of God and must not degrade the divine nature. Paul said sensuality of the body was the introduction of the obscene into the temple of God. The experience of the great values is sharing the life of God.

Plato believed the ideal values would come to their achievement in the social life of man. He expected personality to develop in the process of building the social order; and that social order was no mere human experiment but was the incarnation of the eternal values. Plato would have been quite hospitable to the view that personality is developed through the God experience. The endeavor to live out in social life what God means is personality development.

The most fundamental note in Hebrew prophecy is the coming of the reign of

righteousness and peace, which God is to give to his people when with humble hearts and earnest endeavor they prepare the way. The prophets would not have seen any possibility of character development except through fellowship with God in the great purpose of social righteousness. Jesus believed in the Kingdom of God as the company of the pure in heart who are seeking righteousness. "Repent for the Kingdom of God is at hand," that is: in view of the new social order that is impending, and which you recognize as God's enterprise, seek a new integration of character that you may be fit to be a participant in the good society.

Thus in the religious tradition out of which we have come God is the purpose of social righteousness, he is the lure and call for a better social order, he is the abiding promise, "Fear not little flock, it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the Kingdom." Children easily understand when we tell them that God wants a happy family where each one helps and no one spoils the joy of the shared life. They know how they can further the divine purpose and how easily it can be hindered. That in the harshness and complexity of our adult life we have so largely lost this sense of an enterprise of God may not be so much a sign of maturity as of atrophy. It is a solemn and steady thought that the divine goodness is seeking to achieve something in human business and politics in our generation and is waiting for us to understand. The challenging call is still sounding, "Whom shall I send, and who will go for us?" Growth of personality indeed to be able to answer, "Here am I, send me."

But we must face the difficulty that we do not seem to have experience of a conquering God. Evil is too manifest. How can we believe in a goodness and love that can look upon our dreadful world. A little girl whose mother was suffering said, "There is no good praying. I have tried it, and nothing happened." If anyone has a God experience that everything is for the best, he may get some comfort

for himself but he will not help our modern youth in their problems.

So the age old sense of evil may seem to nullify any God experience that might develop personality and throw us back to the concept of the human struggle amid blind forces. But before we give up to that we must fairly face the problem of good, which is far more difficult than the problem of evil. Hatred, cruelty, and wrong are natural enough in a mechanistic universe, but how did the good values arise? The story of the girlhood of Jane Addams has just come to us. She said, "When I grow up I am going to build a big house and have all the poor children play in my yard." We know she built the big house on Halsted Street, and the children played there. It is easy to understand that drab neglected neighborhood in the struggle for existence, but whence came the gracious soul of Jane Addams, the neighbor? A brilliant young scholar, who once served as secretary to the R.E.A. pondered on the plight of India —its poverty, ignorance, dirt, diseased babies, race hatreds. He wanted to share with his Indian neighbors some of the good things that had come to him in America. The evils of India could naturally come out of the horrible struggle of mankind, but whence came the devotion of Clifford Manshardt?

I say to myself when I am afraid (and sometimes, I confess, an awful fear clutches at my heart), "I live in a universe which produced Jesus." We do not know why the evil is here but we do know that the good is here; and the good is God. There is a moral power that is working in us and through us. The charities and strivings for justice are the working of God. The religious spirit simply refuses to believe that somehow in a blind world man has happened to produce his values. The deepest religious experience has ever seen in God the author and conserver of values. They are more than human, more than planetary; they are cosmic, as real as the mysterious rays that beat upon us

out of the far spaces. Evils, whencever they came, are to be conquered, and God is the champion who leads us in the fight. "They that be with us are more than they that be with them."

This is the God experience of moral enablement. It may be illustrated by a simple story. A mother thought the personality development of her little boy called for rugged discipline, not stupid beatings but strict obedience. One day she told him he must not leave the yard. A little later, happening to look out of the window, she saw a neighbor boy evidently inviting her son to go with him. The tempted lad hesitated, opened the gate and went out, then rushed back shouting, "I can't go out today." When his mother praised him, saying that she had seen the struggle, he answered. "Did you see Jim asking me to go; then why didn't you help a feller?" The little chap's theory of personality development involved a moral companionship, sympathy, cooperation. Paul said, "The Lord stood by me and strengthened me;" Jesus said, "Father, I know that thou hearest me always;" Lincoln told the Lord that the cause was his and he must take care of it. Faber sings, "Right is right, since God is God, and right the day must win, to doubt would be disloyalty, to falter would be sin."

The experience of a cooperating God does not result in carelessness. We know that we must overcome the evil. We must track the disease germs and destroy them; we must find how criminality arises and remove the causes; we must develop an economic system in which all shall be free; we must each overcome selfishness in his own soul and help one another in conflict; we must build the City of God. But we cannot do it alone. If it is only a human enterprise it is hopeless. We cannot do it in the face of a hostile or even an indifferent universe. We need God and we never needed him more than we do now. Personalities transformed by an experience of God can win the victory.

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION AND THE PRESENT SCENE

WHAT KIND OF RELIGIOUS EXPERIENCE IS DEVELOPING AT THE PRESENT TIME?

*A layman's report from the Academy for Adult Jewish Education
conducted by Rabbi Landman at Congregation
Beth Elohim, Brooklyn*

ARTHUR B. BRENNER*

THIS PAPER does not purport to list —much less to describe—the infinite variety of religious experiences which doubtless are developing at the present time. It represents, rather, a layman's conception of a situation which he believes to be so general that it may be regarded as fairly typical, and a report of a specific educational project which undertook to deal with that situation.

THE BACKGROUND

An understanding of the typical lay attitude toward religion requires a realization of the elements of intellectual and emotional conflict which characterize that attitude; the intelligent preparation of any project for adult religious education must envisage the elements of resentment and hostility which inevitably accompany such a condition of conflict. The hypothetical "typical layman" may be quite unaware of either the conflict or the hostility; most probably he is entirely inarticulate with respect to the matter—especially when it is a clergyman who interrogates him; but it should be possible to see some little way into the nature and the source of his difficulties.

The attitude of the typical layman is, I believe, definitely analogous to that of Naaman, as described in the fifth chapter of the Second Book of Kings. Naaman had been cured of his leprosy by the God

of Elisha. Thus he was convinced that Elisha's God, and not his own national God Rimmon, was obviously the true God; but Naaman's official and social position was such that on his return to his own country he must necessarily resume the worship of Rimmon. Therefore, he took back with him two mules' burden of Israelitish soil, to be placed on the floor of the House of Rimmon, so that his thoughts and his prayers might be effectively addressed to the God of Elisha, even while he might be going through the forms of worship of the house of Rimmon.

To re-frame this parable in modern terms, substitute for the house of Rimmon the layman's family church, and for the God of Elisha substitute the great concept of modern science. In the name of science and modern rational thinking, vast numbers of laymen have abandoned not only church membership but all religious interest of any sort; such laymen, presumably, will not be reached by any program which may be evolved by the Religious Education Association; but the more nearly typical layman, the man whom this Association may fairly hope to reach and affect with its conclusions and programs, has not gone quite that far. He still acknowledges some allegiance to the religion of his fathers, but it is a divided allegiance. As he renders to it his formal worship or congregational membership, he does so, like Naaman, "with both feet

*Brooklyn Attorney and Member of the Academy.

on the ground"—placing his real confidence in modern science, and this for the same reason as Naaman's: it is modern science which has cured his diseases and produced similar direct and concrete contributions to his welfare. So far as he is concerned, the truths of religion may, perhaps, be "true" in some very special and qualified sense, but the truths of science are "really true."

All this is merely by way of saying that the background of the layman's thinking is occupied by miscellaneous odds and ends left over after three centuries of the familiar "conflict between religion and science." Presumably every one here is acquainted with the history and the literature of that conflict; presumably every one has his individual or official philosophy by which to reconcile religion and science. But how is it with the typical layman? The relevant question is not "What is the content of the best religious thinking and the best secular thinking of today?" but "What, *in fact*, is the content of the layman's mind with respect to religion and science?"

Whatever may have been his upbringing and education, the mental content of the typical layman will represent not so much some specific point of view or school of thought, as a loose compendium of popular thinking, that aggregate of beliefs and attitudes which, as implicit assumptions, underlie the movies, the *Saturday Evening Post* and the scientific column of the Sunday newspapers. Catholic, Protestant or Jew, his attitude toward his own religion starts with his early religious associations (when he may have either accepted, or rebelled against, religious instruction and discipline); it continues with his present attitude (whatever it may be) toward that childhood attitude, as he remembers and reconstructs it; added to that is his realization of what his friends of *other faiths* believe about his particular church; and behind all there is the great secular trend away from all organized religion—and what religion does he know except organized religion? Equally with respect to re-

ligion and science, current thinking carries over, in popular attitudes, archaisms which may have been good religion or valid science a couple of centuries ago, but which are now in hopeless confusion, not only with one another, but with the more enlightened modern views in the respective fields; the more accurate may be the layman's scientific knowledge, the more likely is he to impute to the church an obscurantist attitude toward this body of scientific truth. In any event, he has a definite impression (and I leave it to you to estimate his justification) that the church still, at heart, would prefer a flat earth and a special act of creation, and has rather quibbled and equivocated in somehow accepting a round earth and a development by evolution.

The emotional trends and desires which used to be called "the religious instinct" still exist and require satisfaction. Our layman remembers with mixed envy and resentment whatever religious experiences he may have had as a child or the religious experiences which he may attribute to his pious grandparents—but he is no longer free to have such experiences himself. It is firmly fixed in his mind that for centuries science had been steadily encroaching upon the field of religion—solving its mysteries, refuting its claims, producing positive and valuable results where the fruits of religion were doubtful or non-existent. He has seen organized religion stand as the defender of the social and economic *status quo*. He is impressed with the honesty and integrity of the scientists, and charges the "good church people" with hypocrisy. Indeed, as is evidenced by the advertising columns, he accords to the scientist the same credulous and even superstitious reverence which was once rendered to the primitive priest or medicine-man.

During the World War, to be sure, he had seen the forces of science turned to purposes of destruction and had realized that undirected science was not sufficient unto salvation. But his confidence in religion is not increased by the conduct of the church during the war.

The post-war period had brought reaction against authority of any kind—a rebellion which used for its own purposes its own garbled interpretation of Einstein and Freud. And yet (evidenced, perhaps, by the very intensity of the rebellion) there still remained the need to find some dignity and serenity, some security and goal, in human life.

The mechanistic view of the universe, the philosophy which underlay the physical sciences and had seemingly eliminated any need or scope for religion, has begun to crumble—according to the newspapers. Certain advanced scientists now express their interpretation of their scientific data in religious terms. Clergymen who—during the irreligious stage of science—had declared that scientific pronouncements were irrelevant and incompetent as a basis for religious conclusions, now triumphantly demonstrate the freedom of the will and the existence of God by reference to the Heisenberg principle of indeterminacy (which I hope they understand). But while the physical sciences are turning away from mechanism and determinacy, the humane sciences (and especially psychology) have become increasingly deterministic.

And in the midst of economic depression, political turmoil and threats of war, mankind looks for something that will give meaning, dignity and hope to human life. Can anyone doubt that the energy behind current economic, social and political movements is of exactly the same sort as would, in other times, have animated religious reformations and revivals?

So modern man, I believe, is definitely and deeply in need of a good old-fashioned religious experience, but he is incapable of having one. The religious subject-matter which was presented to him as a child, which he then either accepted or rejected, and which is the only kind of religion he knows about, he cannot now bring himself to accept. If he should find himself in that mystic, semi-eccstatic state which *you* (some of you)

would call a religious experience, he might be secretly pleased—but he would be doubtful about it and half-ashamed. If you should tell him about *your* religious experience, he might be envious, but he would be skeptical and suspicious.

As is natural for a person in a state of conflict, he looks for some one to blame for his dissatisfaction, and he directs his resentment against the church and the clergy for having cheated him of what he feels entitled to: it is *their* fault that he is deprived of something which would be of value to him, which he believes that his grandparents had, and which the clergy hold themselves out as being able to impart.

This element of resentment may arise in different ways. I see it in my friends who, as children, "always hated" religious school. They did not like their teacher; they had been snubbed by the richer or better dressed children; the schoolrooms were stuffy and uncomfortable; the lessons were uninteresting; their whole mass of association to early religious instruction is unpleasant, and they purport to find "religious people" no better, or perhaps a great deal worse, than themselves. And, on the other hand, there are those who were "good little boys and girls" in religious school. They did their lessons and took their instruction seriously—and then, in the course of growing up, found that much of what they had been taught was untrue and much was useless; that it did not lead simply and directly to an adult religion—or that there was no adult religion available for them to grow up into; they had been compelled to abandon the religious instruction of their early years, and had done so with the same resentful feeling of having been patronized and deceived which characterizes the growing child's abandonment of Santa Claus and the baby-bringing stork.

Thus, the layman's general attitude of conflict toward the entire religious subject-matter leads readily enough to the feeling that he has been cheated and that it was the church and the clergy who have cheated him. I stress this matter, because

it directly suggests both the manner in which the situation is to be met and a difficulty which lies immediately at the threshold of any attempt to meet the situation. Any project for adult religious education must not merely recognize these elements of conflict; it must carry them out into the light for honest discussion; it must evoke them and bring them to articulate expression even (or especially) for those who are only dimly aware that they harbor such doubts and difficulties. The study group must be made to feel that the instructor will not merely tolerate, but desires and will encourage, the free expression of criticism, doubts and hostilities. But how can this be done by the clergyman who has been officiating at religious services and conducting the Sunday school ever since the members of the group were little children, and who, therefore, is the focus of their conflicts and the object of their resentments? Indeed, it is difficult for *any* clergyman to open up and release these conflicts, no matter what may be his personal ability—for the layman of whom I have been speaking will naturally regard all clergymen as the hired advocates of the particular point of view which represents these conflicts and resentments.

THE ACADEMY

In the fall of 1931, at Congregation Beth Elohim in Brooklyn, Rabbi Landman instituted an Academy for Adult Jewish Education under peculiarly happy auspices. In the first place, he was a newcomer to the congregation; he had come with a reputation of being enlightened and progressive; the lay membership, therefore, held tentatively in abeyance the question whether they would or would not identify him with the representative of their early religious instruction. Moreover, he found already in existence and was able to incorporate into his Academy a small lay group which, for some time previous, had been studying and discussing religion under lay leadership—and which, therefore, on their own initiative, had already organized a challenging, if

not definitely rebellious, attitude toward the constituted religious authorities.

The Academy got off to a good start largely because of the manner of Rabbi Landman's initial announcement to the prospective members. At a preliminary organization meeting he asked them whether they knew this, that or the other surprising and new thing about their religion—questions which suggested that there were rational answers to their perplexities and that they did not "have to" believe things that they could not honestly believe. That preliminary meeting appealed directly, and offered a hope of resolution, to that state of conflict which I have outlined.

Rabbi Landman has all along prided himself upon the academic dignity and organization of the Academy; it has a curriculum, a printed catalogue, and mimeographed syllabi; the groups meet in formal classrooms; there are successive classes (grades A, B and C) with different instructors in the several courses; there are convocations and graduations. Doubtless this dignity and regularity has its values; I personally believe that Rabbi Landman over-emphasizes them.

The value which the group found in the courses was that the biblical subject matter and the history of our religion could be presented in a way that "made sense"; that the Bible was composed in a way which they could understand and that a factual knowledge of its history (and not some esoteric kind of "spirituality") was the means which would enable them to read it intelligibly. They found that there was more solid substance in the Bible than could be elicited by the conventional Sunday school question, "What moral lesson do we learn from this little story?" They found, not merely that they did not "have to believe" everything in the Bible, but also that they did not have to *justify* everything in the Bible. They found that they could accept the Bible as a record of a religious evolution, a history of a spiritual development, lived by characters who had been human like themselves, had

faced the same interests and problems with the same needs, the same reactions and the same fallibility as their own, and who sought, as they were seeking, to find the truth.

Whether or not it was intended, the group formed the definite opinion that religion is something worked out in, and emanating from, the human personality—not something promulgated by authoritative revelation.

Probably the central idea which the class formulated was that of the eternal conflict, not so much between good and evil, as between the dynamic and the static: that, from time to time, throughout the history of religious development, a dynamic, revolutionary, spiritual message would be formulated and declared by some "inspired" person (whatever that word may mean); his gospel would thereafter become formalized, codified, ritualized and be taken as the basis for a static cult religion—against which some new prophet would thereafter rebel, only in turn to have his reformation again formalized and reduced to a cult level; that the development of religion represents the interweaving of two traditions, two types of personality—the spiritual, dynamic tradition of the prophet and the evangelist and the more conservative and static tradition of the legislator, the codifier and the minister of the established religion. This critique of religious history, with its implication that the two opposing tendencies are not only in cyclical conflict from time to time and between group and group, but exist in stable or unstable equilibrium in each individual—this was not only an enlightening and clarifying point of view but made contact with and could be taken over into their current personal living. They were able to conclude that those elements in established religion of which they were suspicious and critical were the static, superstitious, cult-making elements; that the progressive, ethical elements which they sought and valued in life (for you must not underestimate the layman's ethical idealism)

found support and vigorous expression in the dynamic religious tradition.

Good enough and valuable so far as it went, this did not go far enough. After three years of study, it still left unanswered the question whether religion was in any substantial sense "true"; whether the whole religious subject-matter was not the result of a childish myth-making process, which scientific rationalism would displace, and which we should be better off without.

In a post graduate course, therefore, Rabbi Landman undertook to "validate the God idea." The attitude of the class was definitely skeptical. After such preliminary discussion as seemed to him appropriate, Rabbi Landman came to his climax: "I know that God exists, because I have experienced Him." The statement fell perfectly flat. The class had a high degree of affection and respect for Rabbi Landman: his personality, his learning, his intellectual integrity, his sympathy for and participation in their religious questionings, gave him great personal prestige. But his statement that he had "experienced God" conveyed no meaning to them.

I have no doubt that they envied him his experience—but they could neither trust nor share it. They remembered that millions of people had "known" with equal conviction that the earth was flat and that the sun revolved around it—and science had proved them mistaken; that other millions had "experienced" Baal, Moloch or Mumbo Jumbo as God—only to be condemned as ignorant and superstitious; that millions today "experience" Hitler or Lenin as the incarnation of ultimate truth—which this group was unable to accept; that lunatic asylums are reputedly full of people who know with certainty that they are Napoleon or Julius Caesar—and who belong in lunatic asylums. And also, perhaps, they recalled that they had heard or read somewhere that some new kind of psychology declares that any interest in God is merely an infantile, dependent, wishful-thinking attempt to project into an indifferent universe some-

thing which is not there. And so the class was puzzled rather than reassured by Rabbi Landman's statement that he had "experienced God."

Rabbi Landman could not continue with this group, because the undergraduate classes, entering each successive year, monopolized his service as instructor. He therefore suggested that I carry on with the group in a second post-graduate course. I had been a member of the group from its beginning, four years past, and had been partly chosen, partly self-elected, as its spokesman for heckling the instructors and giving expression to its criticisms and challenges. A year's work was, therefore, organized with the deliberate purpose of evoking and bringing out into the open the various doubts, criticisms and objections against religion which, more or less articulate, were in the background of the minds of the group. We reviewed from several angles the history of the "conflict between religion and science." (Incidentally, Langdon-Davies *Man and His Universe* is an excellent presentation of this subject-matter). We traced the vestigial survival into contemporary religious concepts of the primitive elements of *mana* and *tabu*. We surveyed the part played by religion in human development—emphasizing the distinction already made between static and dynamic tendencies. Without any necessity for guidance or direction, the group's spontaneous emphasis was on the element of progress, growth, development and self-realization in human life.

Having thus traversed the history of religious and secular thought—however sketchily—to the point where the group members had, each for himself, formulated some kind of idea of the nature of man and his place in the universe, we only then raised the question of God.

With specific purpose the course had been called a Seminar on "The Religious Hypothesis." I had disavowed any intention or ability to "prove" God. We discussed the nature of a hypothesis and concluded it was intellectually respectable—i.e., a "scientific" way to proceed—to for-

mulate, test and adopt a hypothesis as a hypothesis. We, accordingly, developed a religious and a non-religious hypothesis as alternative views of the cosmos. From the group's natural emphasis upon evolution and growth they were able without difficulty to proceed to recognize an "organizing quality" in the universe, with which mankind's distinctively human qualities stood in some special sort of correspondence and relationship. Accepting that picture with varying degrees of conviction, they raised no objection to "God" and the "human soul" expressed in such terms, or the necessity of effecting a harmony between God and man, or the validity of prayer as a discipline and technique for achieving that harmony. When, having gone that far, I explained that that sense of effective harmony with the universe was what Rabbi Landman had meant when he said that he had experienced God, I felt that whether or not they participated in that experience, at least they were now able to attach some personal meaning to the words. And more, that if they ever should find themselves on the threshold of such an experience, they would understand, trust and value it.

It therefore seems to me—and it is my justification for presenting this material in response to the topic assigned—that the work of this Academy has been not merely a project in adult religious education but also an experiment in adult religious experience. Not by exhortation or instruction, but by evoking doubts and rebellions, by compelling the expression of criticisms and perplexities, by suggesting affirmations upon which, not dogmatically but as working hypotheses, they might build their own answers to their own needs, the Academy has, I believe, brought this group to a point where each member has integrated, more or less articulately, his own personal attitude toward religion—reasonably adult, reasonably self-consistent and, whatever its theological imperfections, philosophically and psychologically respectable. If I should read to you their attempts to put on paper their individual

religious philosophies you would say that they had invented nothing new; that they were merely using somewhat modern terminology to express familiar and even conventional religious attitudes. Why should any one expect anything different? But what is important is that, for each member of the group, his religious philosophy represents a genuine conviction, an undivided allegiance. What it may lack in theological elegance it makes up for in pragmatic, functional value; it represents his convictions on all seven days of the week; it is a body of beliefs which he accepts with all the departments of his personality and not merely as being "true" in some special and qualified sense. Above all, and here it makes up for whatever it lacks in definiteness and sharpness of outline, he regards it not as a static and permanent dead-level, but a plateau from which he expects to make further progress.

In proceeding in this manner and toward this avowed goal, we have acted upon the principle that any specific religion, at any particular time, is not what is written in some book or what is declared by its clergy or in its official Articles of Belief; it is what the members of the communion do, in fact, live by, as the focus and center of their lives, the body of implicit assumptions by which their lives are guided and to which their lives give expression; we have told the members of that group that they were not studying but were making their religion. I imagine that this is good pedagogy, but I feel sure that it is a valid religious experience.

Doubtless there are churches where this method of disregarding authoritative

revelation and proceeding from man to God instead of from God to man is theologically unacceptable. It is not to be expected that any single formula will fit all cases. I can only testify that the members of this group—and it was in no respect a special or hand-picked group—found the experience both interesting and helpful; they maintained a high percentage of attendance; they express themselves as having "got a lot out of the course"; and after five years in the Academy they are insistent upon a further course of study being worked out for them. So far as I have means of judging—and I have been a member of the group as well as group leader—the experiment has "worked."

Here, then, is a religious experience in which a group has participated under guidance and leadership. Unless there had been a need and a capacity for that experience, the leadership could not have enforced or compelled it. I have no doubt that similar leadership can repeat the experience with other groups. Lacking that leadership, the same need and the same capacity (which cannot be deemed limited to this particular group) will struggle along—either in a state of continued conflict and dissatisfaction, or achieving such answer as it may be able to work out for itself—which also is a religious experience.

This report can, in a sense, be regarded also as an autobiography of my personal religious experience. I should hate to regard myself as so abnormal that my experiences have been totally alien to those of my neighbors.

This, then, is a description of one kind of religious experience which is developing at the present time.

HOW EFFECTIVE IS RELIGIOUS EDUCATION IN MEETING THE PRESENT SITUATION?

ERWIN L. SHAVER*

WHO is wise enough to answer to this question? After such studies as have been made by Dr. Hartshorne and Dr. May and their associates one hesitates to venture more than an opinion. Even then he must run the risk of "rushing in where angels fear to tread" and being accused of merely expressing one individual's point of view. Once upon a time the speaker attempted an appraisal of the movement for weekday religious education and was met with just such an accusation. At another time he sought to help the troubled denominational publishers answer the question as to whether the proposed new International Curriculum would supplement or supplant the lessons in use by the denominations and found himself between Scylla and Charybdis. These two experiences, fortunately or unfortunately, have left no inferiority complex and he has accepted his present assignment with the hope that he may make a small contribution to our common understanding and interpretation of the rather modernistic and confusing picture of present-day religious education.

We shall not attempt to express our judgment in terms of character products, since we do not have such data as that produced by the Inquiry and various other studies. There are also other factors which must be taken into account. Religious education, as all education, is so enmeshed in the "school of experience" and its results and the outcomes of daily unplanned and unguided activities are so intertwined as to make it difficult if not impossible to separate them. There also seems to be something in human make-up which closes our eyes to the changes which do take place, however slowly, as a result of the procedures and programs we do set going from time to time. For example, I cannot

escape the conviction that much of our present reaching for a solution of world problems and our new born convictions regarding the need for a more socialized religion may be credited to the ideas and the methods which were used in the launching of graded lessons more than two decades ago. We must remember also that religious education, as other forces in our world, is moving forward upon an exceedingly uneven front. This very instability may be looked upon as "darkness before the dawn," provided we are careful in making our comparative studies.

Let us, on the other hand, attempt to appraise the effectiveness of religious education today by asking to what extent it seems to be meeting the present situation: (a) in its expression of aims and objectives, (b) in the way the church is organizing itself for educational purposes, (c) in its curriculum plans and materials and (d) in its selection of teachers and teaching methods. This less direct approach should yield some answers.

EXPRESSED AIMS AND PURPOSES

An examination of the expressed aims and purposes for a religious education program in local churches shows that very few churches have taken the trouble to think through this matter. A denominational state committee in Massachusetts a few years ago found that only a small fraction of some three hundred churches had ever as churches attempted to formulate their goals and that the statements of those which had done so were exceedingly vague and general. Your speaker's impression is that this situation is only too prevalent.

The outstanding work in this field is the statement of "Objectives of Christian Education" developed by the International Council of Religious Education. By a process involving the submission of many

*Congregational Education Society, Boston.

statements and their criticism by several hundred leaders there were finally evolved seven major objectives with thirty-eight subordinate objectives. Some of us who were interested in this project had hoped that it would result in a clarification of aims in local churches and become an incentive for them to develop their own statements. The degree to which this has been the case is not very encouraging.

If time permitted it would be interesting to make a detailed study of these objectives since they represent a considerable number of groups interested in religious education. Perhaps the best appraisal of them from the point of view of our present discussion has come from the parent body itself. Only last year there arose a demand for their revision. Two general criticisms were put forth: In the first place they had been stated primarily in terms of the development of persons as unrelated individuals, not as persons active in a social organism. In the second place they were greatly deficient in specific recognition of the great social problems the world is now facing.

On the other side of the picture we do have some promising developments in the same group which has promulgated these rather general aims. "A Program of Social Education for the Churches," a statement prepared for and adopted by the Council's Educational Commission in February, 1936, stresses "the human values at stake in the social order" and the "function of Christian education in regard to the social order" and indicates the "implications for those engaged in building the church's program" and for local churches and communities.

The United Youth Movement, which originated with the Council and has been most actively promoted by its leaders, reveals, in the Statement of Conviction and other documents which have been issued, a decided awareness of present-day social needs and a determination to "build a new world." The United Adult Movement, just now getting under way, strongly puts to the fore in its statement of

central purpose "the present economic, political and international situation" and the problems related thereto.

A balancing of the idealism expressed in these statements and in movements promoted by leaders at the top with the indifference, fearfulness and even strong antagonism manifest when their implications and applications reach the local church and community indicates that religious education is reaching out for something higher but has by no means achieved it.

EDUCATIONAL ORGANIZATION OF THE CHURCH

Some of us, when faced with the accusation that religious education is a failure, are quite willing to admit what seems to be damaging evidence in support of the accusation. We are quite unwilling, on the other hand, to agree with the implication that it has been given a fair trial. Thus far the average church does not seem to have taken its educational function seriously. Lack of both moral and financial support is still manifest in most churches. Expenditures for directors of religious education, training of teachers and even curriculum materials were the first curtailments when the depression struck. Nor was the situation helped when programs emphasizing a study of world problems began to press for admittance to the school. "Our children are not learning the Bible" was the cry that went up and with it came an increasing opposition to modern methods and modern emphases.

Religious education is still a compartment of the church. Renaming the Sunday school "the Sunday morning session of the church school" has not changed the quality of work. The jurisdiction of most committees of religious education, few of which are in existence and fewer still of which are functioning, is still confined to the Sunday school. Little has been done to correlate the various educational wheels within wheels which have broken the church up into a host of unrelated and often competing organizations. The phrase

"the church as a school" in most quarters is largely wishful thinking.

To be sure there are signs that some churches are trying to improve their situations. In the hope that better teaching will be done some are trying larger classes, but in most of these cases the teaching method remains on the same level as before. The "unified service" seems to some to be the way out. The weekday religious education movement has had success in some quarters but is not revealed as a universal remedy. The vacation school is doing a good piece of work, but it too does not give promise of adoption by the majority of churches. Here and there the wish is expressed that the public school might teach religion, since (so it is implied) the church seems to be such a failure at it! None of these explorations in quest of some new organizational scheme seem to be prompted or aided in its development by a strong desire to meet the pressing social problems of today. They appear rather to be desperate attempts to preserve an institution which will do the thing it has been doing in the past.

In our own denomination and to some extent in others there has been observed a steady decline in Sunday school enrollment. Having had our attention called to this fact, we have been doing some thinking upon the matter. We have come to the conclusion that much of the decline can be accounted for by the fact that other agencies of religious education within the church have been found more interesting and attractive for various reasons. This is especially true in the case of young people and adults, who cannot be forced to go to Sunday school as can little children. The increase of those enrolled in young people's organizations, largely Sunday evening groups, has been gratifying. Adult Sunday school classes are declining; informal adult study and discussion groups meeting at other times are on the increase. Summer conferences, midweek institutes and community schools of religious education are likewise replacing the Sunday school for adults and young

people. We mention these particular shifts in enrollment because they for the most part reveal in their programs a more definite interest in world problems than does the average Sunday school. There is a ray of hope at these points.

Before we pass from this phase of our discussion may we add this point: Other agencies than the church seem to be doing more effectively the thing which the church at heart would like to do—to help persons achieve more abundant life. The "voices of experience," the psychiatrists and psycho-analysts, the newspaper columnists, the counsellors in social organizations, and a number of other persons and agencies are dispensing mental and spiritual aid in ways which seem to be more practical, more effective and less embarrassing. Very few churches have as yet organized "life clinics." Most of them still assume that people are helped by hearing sermons and by engaging in superficial discussions of general principles of living. More and more the churches' educational program has become a mass education program. These other agencies are giving detailed and personalized help to individuals. This type of help is far more effective in developing the kind of person who can stand firm under the pressure of modern life.

THE CURRICULUM SITUATION

The present situation regarding the curriculum seems to repeat the situation of one hundred years ago. The description by Dr. Cope in his *Evolution of the Sunday School* (page 103) is most apt: "A multitude of lesson schemes and textbooks were introduced. So many and so diverse were they that this has been called the 'Babel' period of Sunday-school lessons. The denominations followed the lead of enterprising individuals and each one issued its own series of lessons . . . In this period of ferment each school worked at its problem in pretty much its own way. Many experiments were tried and, unconsciously, preparations were made for a better day."

In our local churches there are many evidences of such a chaos with regard to curriculum. One of these is the almost universal lack of any curriculum plan. In practically every situation the curriculum begins and ends with a collection of quarterlies and texts. There is no statement of aims for the school as a whole, no balancing of content, no provision for continuous progress, no understanding as to who is responsible for setting up a curriculum plan.

There is a constant dissatisfaction with courses. The following is a typical request: "Can you suggest an integrated course of study for seventh, eighth and ninth grades which is interesting, has enough meat in it to hold their respect, not too hard so that they feel it is beyond them and which teaches religion?" Most local leaders seem to feel that their major difficulty is that of finding the right course and the search seems endless.

Within the past few years there has developed a rapidly growing tendency to use fewer curriculum materials. Teachers' helps are first abandoned. Then pupils' materials are discarded, and the teacher depends upon a single pupil's text (it is much simpler to study), uses the Bible solely or tries various other miscellaneous materials. While much of this tendency may be ascribed to reduced budgets these are only contributing factors and often mere excuses.

The result of these and other conditions is that more and more our schools are using an eclectic curriculum but one which is accidental and haphazard rather than chosen with clear standards and objectives in view. One does not have to use much imagination to see what effects on pupils, teachers and religious education as a whole such a trend is having.

Looking for a moment at overhead agencies we find a similar diversity of curricula and a similar confusion of purposes. The number of series is increasing. Witness the increasing interest in and dominance of the Group Graded Lessons of the International Council of Religious

Education. These were at first intended as a compromise by which the Bible centered Uniform Lesson idea might be preserved but incorporate the principle of gradation. At present however, these lessons are veering rapidly away from Bible centeredness and are mainly extra-Biblical in content. Present-day personal and social problems are decidedly prominent. Their unit plan of organization and the teaching methods suggested also reveal a leaning for progressive education.

Another overhead curriculum collision also is taking place in the Council. The "program builders", headed by the national denominational leaders of young people's work, are seeking a correlation between their already organized and promoted program and the lessons of the Group Graded series. A curriculum conference meeting in Pittsburgh this next week is to begin work upon this long side-tracked problem.

We have already indicated that there are two major emphases to be observed in the content of the present-day religious education curriculum. There is in various circles a rather decided "back to the Bible" movement. We need not discuss all the implications of this trend nor attempt to criticise or justify it. Many parents and church school leaders would apparently be quite happy to have their young friends know more about and more of the Bible. This may be and probably is in many cases either an escape from the difficulties involved in applying religion to our world conditions or an honest search for the principles by which they may be solved.

In concluding these brief comments upon the curriculum situation, we must add the fact that there is much more of an attempt to face today's perplexing conditions in organizations and movements somewhat removed from the local church. Of the ten projects now included in the United Youth Program all but the first two are decidedly social in their purpose. Of the multitudes of courses outlined in the new study program for adults de-

veloped by the International Council a refreshingly large proportion are social in point of view.

PRESENT-DAY TEACHERS AND TEACHING

The observations of your speaker would lead him to make certain comments regarding changes which seem to be taking place in the type of teachers in our church schools. The average age of those teaching seems to be lower than formerly, judging by conferences with local church staffs and the attendance at summer schools and conferences. Teachers seem to have little desire to teach and are quite hazy when it comes to the content of their teaching. When the members of the teaching staff of one of our outstanding churches in a great university center were asked whether they were sure of how to proceed when a Biblical miracle situation arose, only one replied that he knew where he stood and taught with conviction.

To meet this difficulty of securing qualified teachers some schools began to hire professionals, that is, until the depression struck. The practice still persists in a limited and modified form. Some churches secure students to take that unruly class of boys; some are using directors and would-be directors without positions to do volunteer work; others are combining classes under the more efficient leaders.

It appears more and more difficult to arouse the interest of the educated and talented people in the church and community in the church's religious education program, both because the church still considers it less important than other things and because it does not give them a chance to use their real abilities and experiences. Some churches, however, are awakening to this problem and are providing for short unit courses each taught by persons of standing who are experienced and "at home" in the field of the particular unit. One church this year has enlisted a half dozen public school leaders by introducing such a plan.

The movement for training teachers and other leaders is holding its own. Every church realizes that effective religious

education is to come not alone through a modernized plant and equipment, nor through introducing the best curriculum materials, but through better teachers and better teaching. A few churches have acted upon this knowledge and built a program of training their present and prospective leaders through local church classes and workers' conferences, and community and summer schools. A variety of plans for raising the standards for teachers, such as commissioning services, retreats, and the certification of teachers, have helped. But, until our churches take the necessity of training their lay leaders more seriously than they have in the past or are doing at present, we cannot expect better teaching.

For this reason and the other conditions we have enumerated, the quality of the present teaching process remains discouragingly low. Teaching in most churches, both in the pulpit and in the church school, is still a matter of "telling" plus some discussion. This faith in the spoken word as the almost exclusive means of developing rich and strong personalities shows a pitiful ignorance of how personality actually grows. There have been some gains in teaching method: The teachers are somewhat more intelligent than formerly; there is more discussion in class and other groups; there is some increase in activities supplementary to the lessons and some increase in creative pupil activity. To offset these small gains there is less attention being paid to the individual pupil and his life needs than teachers formerly gave and fewer midweek contacts with pupils than in the past.

In conclusion: In the light of these glimpses of religious education, as shown by its expressed aims and purposes, the educational organization of the church, the curriculum situation and present-day teachers and teaching, we believe that although the movement as a whole is not very effective in meeting the needs of today, it is aware of them at a number of points, and forces are at work which should give us hope.

WHAT MAY BE EXPECTED OF RELIGIOUS EDUCATION IN THE PRESENT SCENE?

*A Symposium**

ERNEST M. BEST

THREE ARE three things with which I should hope this religious education movement would concern itself.

First, I should hope we would return to the original drives behind this organization and concern ourselves with the primary issues of our day. We are, perhaps, too much concerned with theological issues and the minutiae of method. I would like to see us concern ourselves more with the primary issues of our contemporary life, and less with the transcendental or humanist function of religion. In international relations we face the primary issue of whether within this next generation, perhaps within a very few years, we shall find ourselves involved in another world war. How important that we keep the mind of religious people, of social idealists. In Canada we feel ourselves more directly caught. Press commentators in the United States discuss what England is doing to prevent an outbreak or encourage it, and what Germany and France are doing. I should like to emphasize the responsibility of your republic for world peace. When war arises, inevitably the United States will be caught in the current with its full implications. There should be consideration of the foreign policies of all countries, to discover whether the policies of governments are laying the foundations for peace, or inevitably laying the foundations for war.

Is the policy of isolation from political relations and of piling up armaments likely to lead to peace, or to war?

Another problem concerns the economic form of government. We are in the midst of an economic revolution, but during the last two days I do not think strangers from some other country or some other world would have guessed it. There are forces at work carrying us along toward a crisis which will affect every one of us and every institution to which we belong. The problem is whether we shall play our part in helping to avoid a revolution of violence, of civil war, and of unbridled fury, or whether we shall do something to ameliorate and adjust our friends of the bourgeois order to which we belong to a more equitable economic system.

Still another contemporary problem concerns good government. All our traditions about good government and our faith in the organization of this country and of Canada and of Great Britain are challenged. There will need to be adjustments without undue delay, perhaps in our constitutions, certainly in the administration of justice. The question of the relationship between church and state, and of the relation of the individual to the state, cannot be indefinitely postponed. The individual must have the defense of a group, possibly the religious group, to protect his liberties. The relation of school and state is involved. We have in Canada the possibility of teaching religion in state schools, but we must separate that relationship from political encroachment.

In the second place, I would hope that the Religious Education Association would more earnestly consider the problem of method. We need to restudy our methods and improve those by which thinking is carried forward effectively.

*The four brief addresses which form this symposium were given at the closing session of the Pittsburgh Convention. They were reported stenographically, and the speakers have not had opportunity to correct the manuscripts. Mr. Best is Secretary of the National Council of Y.M.C.A.s of Canada; Dr. Landman is Rabbi of Congregation Beth Elohim, Brooklyn; Dr. Case is Professor of Religious Education in Teachers College, Columbia University; and Dr. Coe was Professor of Religious Education in the same institution until his retirement several years ago.

An illustration in Canada is the League of Nations Society. One of the lay leaders in this society, with no professional training, recently outlined what is involved in group discussion and made a better exposition and a clearer one than even Garrison Elliot himself! There are study groups all over the country where people read and discuss the real issues brought before them. We need to study some of the processes which the Communists and other groups have developed in the way of technique. Communists, a small group of two or three hundred, almost without money and with very little educational background, in our city of Toronto, can command the attention of the city. Sometimes religious educators have not used the very best techniques and have not succeeded very well. The public is surrounded by propaganda over the radio and through the newspapers. We need to renew attention to method.

A third problem to which religious edu-

cation might profitably give attention is that of cooperation with other agencies concerned with primary issues. The social idealism of our generation often expresses itself outside the formal institutions of religion. In Canada it is expressing itself, for example, through the League of Nations Society, and we find a very intense interest in it. A great many people, ordinary good people, have turned away from church activities and are expressing themselves through other means. The cooperative Commonwealth Federation of Canada is gathering together a great deal of the social idealism of this generation. Members are giving themselves without money and without price in order to make this socialized conception of society effective. We shall strengthen our own cause of religious education if we join with some of these groups and take advantage of their energy and enthusiasm and conviction.

ISAAC LANDMAN

The Chairman has asked me to present a short statement in answer to the question: "What can be expected of religious education in the present scene?", particularly with reference to adult education. I have attempted, as we went along with the set addresses and the informal discussions from the floor, to formulate a reply and beg to submit three conclusions. We should expect from adult religious education in the present scene:

1. that it reorient the adults' attitude toward religion;
2. that it dissolve the conflicts which perplex the adult who can no longer square the religion that was taught him in his childhood with the maturity of his mind;
3. that it motivate the adult consciously to strengthen the spiritual aspects of living and designedly to contribute to human welfare.

1. It has been clearly demonstrated on this floor that modern men and women of adult mind and mature thinking challenge the religion of their fathers as inadequate to meet their maturity of thought and experience. John Dewey described a picture that has been current during the life of nearly two generations when he said that "skepticism becomes the mark and even the pose of the educated mind." It appears to me that religious educators must restudy the content of their material and the method of their instruction to meet this challenge. We may confidently expect that they will raise religious education for adults to an adult estate, comparable to the intellectual plane on which science and the arts are taught to mature men and women.

There are two qualities, it seems to me, that distinguish the intelligent adult today: his awareness of the process of

change in the social order as in the physical universe, and his personal willingness to assume some measure of responsibility for these changes. We should count upon adult religious education to build up a similar awareness as regards the process of change and responsibility in religion. To this end, we might expect two approaches from religious education of adults: (a) to remould its methods so as to create this awareness, and thereby fore-stall the skepticism that results in indifference to and rebellion against religion; and (b) to inspirit the fundamental principles and doctrines of our faiths so as to integrate them into the pattern of mature thinking. The possibility lies here to reorient toward religion the adult mind that is delving into secular knowledge so that it may, at the same time, search after and find God.

2. The religious conflicts that harass the modern adult, as has been shown during the discussions, arise from the seeming irreconcilability of certain religious doctrines and formulae, taught him in his immature years, with the maturer conclusions at which he has arrived in his adulthood. I do not mention any of these doctrines and formulae, because I do not presume to judge where truth lies.

To some extent most adult persons today have expanded their knowledge of the universe and are conscious of the broader implications in human relations. In many instances, it is true, the extent of this knowledge is not only narrow in comprehension but poor in content, as evidenced by our soap-box agnostics and atheists. And just because the extent of this knowledge, in many instances, is derived from and does not go beyond the

feature articles in the tabloids and the Sunday sections of the better newspapers, we have a right to expect that adult religious education will be so organized and developed as to dissolve the conflicts that arise from vagaries, half-truths, under-baked science and misrepresented theology.

3. Religion is the first of the human experiences that provided man with the idea of a world-outlook. This world-outlook is summed up in the vague and obscure concept of the brotherhood of man. I think we may admit, I might say confess, with a sense of humiliation, that religion which first broke through the iron circle of savage and brutal individualism with an ideal of world-outlook, has failed in practice, for whatever reasons, to follow up its advantage for bettering human relations. It is this failure on the part of both Judaism and Christianity, after several thousand years, to better human relations, that creates indifference and hostility to religion in many an adult mind and on the part of many a mature thinker. More critical still is the adult in the modern scene who observes that even within Judaism and within Christianity it has not yet been shown that the individual adherents behave themselves better toward each other than they do toward adherents of other faiths and other creeds.

What we may expect of adult religious education, therefore, is to ascertain and frankly to teach why religion has failed so woefully in this respect, why Jews do not behave in accordance with the loftiest principles of Judaism and why Christians do not behave in accordance with the loftiest ideals of Christianity.

GEORGE A. COE

We cannot separate the future of religious education, either ultimately or in the immediate future, from what happens to education generally. Great social waves move us all. At the present moment

there is a widespread assault upon culture. We are part of the objects of that assault. We are bound up with the teachers in the public schools. We are bound up with the professors in the universities.

We are bound up with the minority groups who are being suppressed. Our future depends upon the future of these other groups. We have denial of freedom of assemblage, denial of freedom of speech, denial of the ordinary civic rights of the citizen.

We cannot continue to teach freely in the churches if that process continues, for the same thing is starting in the churches in pressure upon the teachers to be silent. The very same forces are at work in the churches. The assaulters do not use clubs in the churches, but they do use financial power. There is discrimination now, and there will be discrimination in the future. We who stand for progressive religious education belong to the social minority groups. Against them the powers that be are largely arrayed in assault upon what is called secular culture, but what we would like to call religious. What are we going to do in this situation?

I do not think we should conceal the seriousness of our situation. We are a part of a minority. We are part of a minority that is distrusted even by those who employ us in the churches. We are being watched. The financial power in the churches is being used already to determine the kind of teaching that shall take place in the pulpit and in the church school. There is not a meeting of church young people for the purpose of considering the conditions of the world and the relations of religion to these conditions that is not watched, censored and even counteracted by church forces. There is not a denominational group that has attempted aggressive action in the direction of Christian social religious education that is not suspected and liable at any time to find itself opposed by the powers that be. That is the situation.

What should be our policy? We should select the tactical point which will give us the greatest strength and put our oppo-

ents in the weakest position. I wish to suggest a piece of tactics. It is to insist on teaching *known facts that concern the development of human personality*. We have been considering in this Convention, personality, how it is affected by present conditions. We should take to our churches just facts. Note the nature of these tactics. If we say we are going to indoctrinate our pupils in the political philosophy that we hold, we take a weak position; but if we say we ask for no privilege but opening to the young people of the churches the actual facts of present life as they bear upon the development of personality, who can resist?—except clandestinely. We should take that position definitely and stick to it. A position of strength, if taken openly and if secretly opposed, will give us a definite advantage in exposing that secrecy. So we shall win. A great mass of people would stand by us on this rational and wholly religious approach to life.

What will be the effect if we can hold and win the opportunity to teach the young on that basis? Certain things will result. We shall have what we commonly call intelligence in regard to social issues. There will be intelligence about existing events and existing efforts that affect the development of personality. Food affects that, as you know. Who has enough food? whether children are well fed? etc. See how far that will lead. We shall develop more than what is commonly called intelligence. There will be more than an abstract grasp. We shall develop human fellowship. When people know the facts in regard to their neighbors, they enter into sympathy with their neighbors. Intelligence is the road toward those things we prize so highly—sympathy, understanding, fellowship, readiness to help, readiness to sacrifice, readiness to become, if necessary, the suffering servant on behalf of those who need us.

ADELAIDE T. CASE

I have put what I want to say in a series of propositions and have divided these between what we may *expect* of religious education and what we may *hope* that religious education will accomplish.

(1) We can expect a new interest in the Bible in religious education. We can hope that this will be an interest which means an emphasis upon the Bible as social experience, something along the line of Wallace's book, *God and the Social Process*.

(2) We can expect a new emphasis upon the importance of the church as a corporate body. We can hope that the church will offer a critical approach to contemporary life in terms of human need and a searching and encouraging discipline in fellowship. We can hope that the church will not align itself definitely with any narrow class or national group but will be universal in its aspect and point of view. We can hope that the church will not be opposing the world, in spite of the two Niebuhrs and Mr. Pauck, or isolate itself from the world, but will throw itself wholeheartedly into movements for the betterment of conditions.

(3) We can expect continued economies in religious education. We can expect they will take form in two ways: first, there will be a continued effort to secure devoted and able women who will work for a disgracefully low wage and like it; and second, that there will be an effort on the part of pastors to direct and carry on the entire educational program of their churches. We can hope for a generous minded opposition to the exploitation of women in religious education and some real solidarity on the part of women themselves. We can hope that ministers will

really learn to fraternize with children and young people and that theological seminaries will be willing to give them more adequate training for their educational responsibilities than is now available.

(4) We can expect a certain amount of indifference and even contempt to be shown toward workers who think it is still worth while to work in the church. We can hope for a wholesome self-respect on the part of workers who have been rather defensive or apathetic.

(5) We can expect an increased interest in parent education and a new initiative on the part of parents themselves in the religious development of their children. We can hope that parents will take the leadership in progressive religious education as they have done in a good many communities in progressive day school education.

(6) We can expect an increase of emphasis on authority in religion and education, as well as in our political and civic life. Now, honestly, we cannot hope that this authority will represent the best of our traditions, nor do I think we can hope that it will be democratically constituted or reviewed. We can hope that this authority will be resisted on the part of the church, or at least on the part of groups within the church; that this authoritarian trend will be resisted in the name of human freedom and in the name of personality. In this resistance we may deepen our faith and also deepen and extend our fellowship as religious people and as religious workers.

We can expect that some but not all of our hopes will come true.

WHAT MAY BE EXPECTED OF RELIGIOUS EDUCATION IN THE PRESENT SCENE?

HUGH HARTSHORNE*

IF I WERE to take quite literally the topic proposed for this final address of the conference, my paper would consist of one word—"Nothing." By this I do not mean that religious education is "in the red." Rather that when all is said and done that religious education says and does, the net result is that the world is just where it was before. Profit and loss just balance. The production of ethical values accumulates no assets with which to meet emergencies such as those civilization now faces. And unless radical changes are made in the basic processes of this great industry, it will not save us from moral bankruptcy. Possibly religion cannot do so, in any case. If this should be true, then it would obviously be too much to expect that education in religion would be of much service to social justice or individual emancipation.

Even if we should be unwilling to admit the futility of *religion*, however, there are those who would express doubt as to the power of *education* to affect behavior in those areas of human conflict out of which the present emergencies arise. Even if education could so train growing children that they would achieve the motives and skills needed to cure the social ills of to-day, nevertheless it is not allowed to do so, since any general reconstruction of human institutions in the interest of justice would jeopardize the privileges of those who now control the educational process. And this naturally would not be permitted.

If these judgments as to the value of religion and of education in affecting human nature and social change are sound, perhaps we have been expecting too much of religious education and been wasting our energies on futile tasks. Sober re-

views of what goes on under the name of religious education, however, tend to the conclusion that while a great deal of energy is being unwisely expended, the fundamental difficulty with religious education is not that we have been expecting too much of it, but that we have been expecting altogether too little. We have been content with easy victories, but have rarely undertaken any major campaigns. We have reduced the amount of superstition in religious teaching. We have graded the lessons. We have purified the worship. We have begun to center attention upon the experience of pupils in their sundry human relations and to encourage them to think about the gross realities of greed and injustice as these operate in their own communities and even among their own people. But situations change so rapidly and differ so radically from community to community that the unwieldy machinery we have set up for accomplishing these reforms is almost hopelessly unable either to make religion a vital, living, concrete force or to make any effective use of educational technique. As a movement, religious education lacks an intelligent strategy adapted to the necessities of modern life. Without such a strategy translated into the plans and programs of religious organizations, no matter what may be their intentions, very little genuine achievement is to be expected of them.

We who are assembled here belong to these organizations and in many instances hold positions of influence in their counsels. Can we help each other to cut the Gordian knot that binds us to precedent and rule, and so free our energies for more immediate and effective action?

The Religious Education Association, which has no connection with any of these organizations, exists to make this fellowship in discovery possible and to provide for its members a few of those

*President of the Religious Education Association. Research Associate in Religion, Yale Divinity School.

high moments of religious experience which grow out of mutuality of purpose. If I had nothing more to say than to extend to all who believe in religion and in education an invitation to join with us in counsel and mutual encouragement, I would have said enough in answer to the query proposed in our topic. For the Association, much less any one address by one of its members, holds no brief for any panacea and makes no blueprints for the guidance of individuals or institutions.

It must not be expected, therefore, that I shall set forth in my remaining remarks a clear-cut and definite program for all the forces of religious education. I have already raised enough debatable issues to occupy hours of discussion. In these few minutes I can only pick out one aspect of the present scene and note its bearing on the purpose and methods of religious education.

The aspect of the present scene to which I shall refer is the increasing provision for leisure, whether compulsory through unemployment, or through the shortening of the hours of work; and the aspect of religious education which I take as most pertinent to this situation is the factor of motivation. Whether the motives of men lead to constantly changing situations or changing situations alter motives, in any case the patterns of any culture cannot be dissociated in fact from the basic drives for which they afford the channels of expression.

What a man does with his life is a religious problem. As Professor Calhoun* has recently reminded us, a man's vocation is his divine calling, whether he give himself to building houses, making shoes, or nursing the sick. By labor man unites himself with the world and thus fulfills his human destiny as a child of time and space. From this discipline of labor there is no escape. But in our western culture we have given a peculiar twist to this basic fact which changes it from a blessing into a curse. The making of shoes in the old days was an art to which

a man could give himself, with a sense of satisfaction and dignity. But today the making of shoes is a grad-grind process of routine drudgery to which a man can contribute nothing but a meager mechanical skill. Such work is done not for the love of it, but for the pay envelope. This in itself is bad enough. But far worse is the fact that the reasonable attitude toward work as the way man not only made his living but also achieved his full stature as a man has continued to characterize our culture even though the work most men can now do no longer affords them any such opportunity for spiritual development. Consequently the old idea that it was a disgrace to be idle, even a misdemeanor punishable by fine or imprisonment, still is in force, though there be no work at all and though such work as there is be such as to destroy rather than to create a soul.

Hence we see such strange and cruel practices today as the condemnation and ostracism of the unemployed, turning misfortune into defeat and defeat into murderous destruction of personality.

The fact is that whether under capitalism or some alternative order, the economic basis of life has so changed that corresponding changes in our ethical outlook are imperative if men are to find in this life the chance to work out their destiny as human beings. Vocation can no longer be identified with economic employment. Our culture is shifting from a culture of work to a culture of leisure. Whether all are to be employed a few brief hours a week, or whether some will be employed long hours and others not employed at all, in either case the total bulk of leisure will be enormously increased, during which men, whether or not they wish it so, will not be engaged in earning their living in the ordinary sense of the term, but will be free to utilize life in ways undreamt of by the wage slave of yesterday or the serf of the day before. What were once men's avocations are fast becoming their vocations, and the divine call to pour out one's

*God and the Common Life

life in labor which shall unite one with the world of time and space takes on fresh meaning in terms of new ventures in creative living.

Let us see how the new and coming leisure offers to religious education both obligation and opportunity.

First, there is the problem of conserving the mental and spiritual health of those who now suffer from the double tragedy of unemployment and the social ostracism that so often accompanies it. One may take it that the first step in any plan for the saving of souls thus threatened with destruction is a thoroughgoing reconstruction of social attitudes toward those out of work. Only a deeper understanding of the meaning of the cultural changes to which I have referred can be expected, however, to bring this about. In other words religious education must include education in economics if it is to be effective in the creation of understanding among men. Likewise, those who have been plunged into ruin must be protected from the false self-blame and loss of self-respect which is their inheritance from the culture of yesterday. The rebuilding of attitude toward work and the lack of work is not an impossible task of religious education.

Second, however, is the equally certain conclusion that changing our attitudes toward the meaning of work will not be sufficient to secure the spiritual health of the disinherited. In some way their stake in the economic life of the world must be reestablished. Many ways of accomplishing this have been proposed and it is not my purpose to advocate one rather than another. That fundamental changes in our way of wresting a living from mother earth are demanded is obvious to all but the most prejudiced. But it is equally clear that no alternative to our present system, whether this is brought about by gradual processes or suddenly, can possibly be achieved or carried on with success without a vast amount of education. What better use of leisure, whether forced or natural,

could be made than by employing it to develop the motives and skills demanded of a more humane social order? Probably nothing could afford so certain a barrier against mental breakdown as the sense of fellowship in a cause far transcending in importance the occupation by which one may or may not be earning one's living—the cause of creating a just social order—a new vocation—a divine calling to which many men may now perhaps be led to listen for the very reason that what they once thought to be their vocation has dropped out from under their feet. To cherish the vision of a new world and the sense that we are not alone in the long labor of its realization is not an impossible task for religious education.

In the third place, and finally, there is the relation of the new leisure to the problem of motivation. No longer driven by the necessity of toiling all their waking hours, how will men spend their time? Leisure for human beings whose interests do not reach beyond the gratification of physical senses could be even more destructive than slavery. Yet disciplined to engage in activity for the sake of money rewards, as men have been in recent generations, what motives other than carnal satisfactions may be expected to operate? Neither religion nor education has an answer wholly appropriate to the present scene.

The culture of yesterday rewarded industry and thrift and its religion supported these virtues by providing a future life which compensated for any discrepancies that occurred in the application of the doctrine that prosperity invariably followed hard work and thrift. As conditions have changed, these discrepancies have become more numerous—so numerous, indeed, as to be almost the rule. The harder a man works the less he seems to have—and the more, by implication, he needs the consolation of the hope of future reward and the stimulation of fear of punishment if he departs from the path of virtue. But unfortunately, along with the revolution in industry, which has

made this life so precarious for the vast majority, has also come the revolution in theology which discounts other worldly hopes and fears. Superstition no longer provides for conduct the sanctions which depended for their effectiveness on man's egocentricity. Selfishness could produce a not too evil society as long as there was room for the selfish motives to operate without neighbors destroying each other to get access to food and shelter. Selfishness in the sense of fear of punishment could then operate under law to restrain the worst offenders as long as law was enforced by some powerful authority supported by divine espionage over the unseen violations which, apart from future retribution, would go unpunished. With the relaxing of central authority and the development of democratic procedures, selfishness became less and less effective as a means of control, for men learned how to escape human punishments and ceased to believe in future retribution. Thus we come to the end of our era, and the ancient prophetic insights into the futility of egocentric motives as the basis of a stable society are being fulfilled before our eyes. Selfishness will not work. Whether we call this the judgment of God on history or the working out of natural consequences in the field of human relations, the net result is the same. Some way must be found of shifting the focus of man's activity from himself to the world of reality around him. Whether we call this "seeking justice and mercy and walking humbly with God," or "seeking first the Kingdom of God," or being "converted," or "clarification," or "objectivity of mind," in any case it is clear that there is a quality of life possible for men which without reference to rewards and penalties supplies its own adequate motivation and carries with it the evidence of its divinity.

Yet, in spite of the conviction of prophets and psychologists, we have not made a great deal of progress toward the establishment of social-mindedness as the prevailing motivation of human behavior. Doubtless it was easier to fall back on

a hell to punish the wicked and a heaven to reward the righteous. Strange that the same doctrine could justify the docile industry of the laborer and also the vast concentration of wealth and power which his docility and labor made possible—not for himself, but for those who, operating on the same motives, but with more intelligence, could claim for their actions the blessing of both church and state. We find a good deal of fault with the profit motive but it would seem that our present capitalist order could not run without its free play. But paradoxically, as already suggested, it is extremely doubtful whether, in the absence of future compensation, the profit motive will continue to serve to keep men at work when the rewards all seem to be going to those who are in a position to live upon the work of others. Nor is it apparent that any other type of social arrangement could work at all on the basis of the profit motive. Nevertheless, for generations men have been trained from earliest childhood to work for extraneous rewards and to associate all values of life with economic employment for pecuniary advantages.

To attempt to reconstruct the economic order without planning at the same time to provide for the education and re-education of motives would seem, then, to be of all futilities the most futile. What is gained by giving the outs their innings if the forces are left at work which must inevitably destroy any society? Here, if anywhere, is strategy needed, if men are to continue living on this planet.

Has religious education a contribution to make at this point? And does the present trend toward a culture of leisure suggest any possible line of action?

For many sincere persons, the only way open to them to attack the injustices of our civilization is the direct attack upon specific instances of corruption, exploitation, and greed, or upon the social conditions and institutions which make these possible. Such attacks will doubtless always be needed. But this is not

enough. There is also the problem of developing organized life on a new level. In the economic sphere, at present and perhaps as long as capitalism continues, this higher level of life would seem to be impossible. But for most of mankind, the economic life occupies a decreasing amount of time and attention, and their major energies are left free for something else. Why not take advantage of this unprecedented opportunity to work out a way of leisure in terms of activities which do not require economic rewards for their motivation? Not every man can be a doctor, or lawyer, or engineer, and find in his occupation ample opportunity for the exercise of his creative interests and talents. But every man can produce something of beauty or use for the fun of it, and vast numbers can be taught to sing and act for the joy of singing and acting together, and practically everyone can be led into the study of human achievement in at least one of its manifold forms, and there is no known limit to man's capacity for learning the skills of social intercourse and self-management, which in their more formal aspects constitute the life of the good citizen. In any or all of these activities men easily learn to lose themselves to find themselves in a larger reality of common endeavor. It is not far from this discovery of selfhood in the mutuality of joint enterprises to the reality of life divinely ordained and a sense of vocation divinely ordered. Life is for man and to live it well is man's chief end, for how else can God be glorified?

Thus it is my humble suggestion that we stop worrying exclusively about the operation of the profit motive in industry and business and as religious educators begin to focus our attack at the point where results may be assured. Let us begin to train men to live and act for other reasons than profit in those unexplored areas of leisure where they are free for the moment from the pressure of competition and the fear of consequences. If we cannot change our cul-

ture all at once, let us change it where we can and let something of the light of heaven in where now all is darkness, fear, and hate. Doubtless through other agencies than the schools changes will take place in our ways of carrying on the economic life of the world, but even if this happens, such changes will be of small value unless men are trained to work for something other than personal rewards whether in this world or the next. In our just indignation over the wrongs of our social order let us not lose the larger perspectives. For it is from these perspectives that we gain insight into the effective strategies by which the major campaigns of the fight against oppression can alone be won.

Many activities besides education go to the making of human life. But it is of education, particularly of education in religion, that we are thinking this evening. If there is any meaning at all to these words by which they serve to distinguish this one activity from others, it is that by religious education youth are introduced into all the rest that makes up life in such ways as will enable them to become skilful participants at the highest possible level for each. The highest possible level is determined not only by native capacity but also by the limitations to opportunity imposed by conditions and customs, over which educators have no direct control. It is, therefore, not the intention of this paper to imply that these conditions and customs should not be remedied by direct action as rapidly as possible, but only to suggest that the task of religious education at this point is primarily to help all who are still capable of growth to learn what the facts are and to achieve the skills and motives in human relationships on which all changes must be based if they are to serve mankind or to endure. Let this task be forgotten, and in no other human activity will there be found the will, the patience, or the opportunity to enable the immature to acquire the spiritual dimensions of citizens of God's universe.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE TO THE ASSOCIATION

ERNEST J. CHAVE*

AT THE LAST annual meeting of the Religious Education Association, held in Rochester, the affairs of the Association had reached a low ebb. The General Secretary, Mr. J. M. Artman, resigned, and the members present were divided as to whether they should go on. It was finally decided to continue the Association on a volunteer basis of service. Responsibility was divided between the president, a Program Committee centered in New York, and an Editorial Committee and Executive Committee located at the place of publication, Chicago. The Executive Committee was charged with the responsibility of maintaining an office, publishing *RELIGIOUS EDUCATION*, and financing the organization.

For nearly ten years the Association has been handicapped with a debt ranging from about \$20,000 to \$25,000. In good times this was taken for granted, interest was paid, one instalment was discharged and another added. Under an enthusiastic, active secretary and with an extensive program, the Association forgot its debts. But when the depression came and income began to slow down, the debt loomed up and threatened to stop us. Some of us refused to solve our problems by bankruptcy, and had faith that the Association could continue.

The Executive Committee cut expenses to a minimum, and decided not to incur new obligations without having monies in hand. The first objective was to renew publication of *RELIGIOUS EDUCATION*, which had been allowed, on account of finances, to be suspended for a year. The library was sold and all equipment disposed of except enough for one small room. Rental was reduced to \$20 per month, and office costs to about \$100 per month. The journal has been published and a campaign has continued through

the year for renewals and new members. On account of suspended publication and uncertainty as to future some members let their memberships lapse. Gradually these are coming back into membership and regular income is assured.

After a year's struggle, with one creditor suing for payment, and more trouble in sight, the Executive Committee decided to make the creditors an offer of settlement. They reckoned what they might be able to pay under reasonable expectations and agreed that the best possible offer that could be made and carried out was a forty percent compromise on a basis of ten-year notes, without interest. The offer was generously accepted by all creditors. This means putting into our regular budget the sum of \$1,000 a year for the next ten years. With expenses at a minimum, working on a volunteer basis, we expect to pay this, and to publish the journal, on a total budget of less than \$5,000 a year. The Executive Committee regretted exceedingly to have to ask our creditors for such a discount, and especially to ask our former Secretary to make such a sacrifice when he had personally assumed a large note of the Association in a previous crisis. However after a year's experience this seemed the only practical way to make any settlement and to continue the program of the organization.

The magazine *Character*, started by Mr. Artman, was taken over by him for an agreed amount to be charged against our indebtedness to him. The Executive Committee promised to send *Character* to all regular members of the Association for a year, and have now extended that offer for another year. Members and friends of Mr. Artman will be glad to know that in spite of handicaps he is making progress with this publication venture and hopes ultimately to make it a success.

*Chairman of the Executive Committee.

BY-LAWS OF THE RELIGIOUS EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

As Revised at the Annual Meeting, Pittsburgh, April 15-17, 1936

ARTICLE I

NAME, PURPOSE, PLACE

Section 1. Name. The name of the corporation shall be "The Religious Education Association."

Section 2. Purpose. The purpose of this Association shall be the promotion of fellowship in the study of the aims, the processes and the emerging issues of moral and religious education.

Section 3. Place. The business of said corporation shall be conducted from Chicago, in the State of Illinois; and its business office be at such place in said city as its directors shall from time to time decide.

ARTICLE II

MEMBERSHIP

Section 1. Members. The membership of the Association shall consist of all persons who have paid the annual fees in such amount as may be determined and published by the Association. The Board of Directors has the right to accept or to reject any and all applications for membership.

Section 2. Kinds of Membership. (1) *Active* members shall be persons engaged in, or interested in the work of religious and moral education, and who have paid the annual fee. (2) *Active Contributing* members shall be individuals or institutions electing to pay amounts above the regular annual fee.

Section 3. Duration of Membership. A written application for active membership and its acceptance by the Board of Directors shall constitute an agreement to continue such membership and to pay annual dues, unless written notice is given by the member to discontinue membership or his dues shall become six months overdue. Membership may be resumed on payment of regular dues.

Section 4. Fees. All fees shall become due at the date of joining the Association

and annually in advance. If desired, at any time, the annual fee may be paid in two semi-annual installments. The annual fee for members shall be \$4.00, excepting for students in higher educational institutions, for whom the annual fee shall be \$2.00 during their period of enrollment.

Section 5. Voting Privileges. Any active member, or active contributing member, in good standing at the time of the annual meeting, or of any special meeting, shall be entitled to one vote.

Section 6. Organ of the Association. Each member shall receive the Journal of the Association, RELIGIOUS EDUCATION. The annual subscription fee for libraries or for persons who do not want to become members of the Association shall be \$3.50.

ARTICLE III

MANAGEMENT AND CONTROL

Section 1. Annual Meeting of the Members. The members of the Association, in their annual meeting or in special meetings, shall have authority to amend the constitution, to change the by-laws, or to conduct the affairs of this corporation in any way which they see fit. The annual meeting shall be held in the month of April or May, or at other times when announced, and at such places as the Association may decide, due notice being given to the members at least one month in advance in the Journal or by special announcement.

Section 2. Quorum. Twenty-five members of the corporation present in person shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business at any regular meeting of the Association. Special meetings may be called upon request of a majority of the Board of Directors or upon written request of 75 members of the Association.

Section 3. Board of Directors. The

affairs of the corporation shall be managed and controlled, between meetings of the Association, by a Board of Directors, to be elected at the annual meetings of the Association. The Board shall consist of the elected officers of the Association and thirty members to be elected for periods as hereinafter stated.

Of the thirty directors specified above, each year ten shall be chosen for three years, or until their successors shall be elected.

Section 4. Vacancies. Vacancies on the Board of Directors may be filled by the directors for any part of a term where such memberships on the Board may become vacant.

Section 5. Compensation. No director shall receive a salary or compensation for services as a director.

ARTICLE IV BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Section 1. Board of Directors. The Board of Directors, elected by the Association, is responsible to the Association for the management and control of the Association. The Board shall be responsible for: (1) providing for the safe keeping and expenditure of all funds of the Association; (2) carrying into effect the policies determined by the Association; (3) appointing the members of the standing committees provided by the Association; (4) appointing a General Secretary for such time and at such salary as they may decide, and appointing an Editor for RELIGIOUS EDUCATION after recommendation by the Editorial Committee for such a period and salary as the Board may decide; (5) publishing the report of the conventions, of special committees, and such other material as shall further the purposes of the Association, in RELIGIOUS EDUCATION or by other suitable means; (6) carrying on any matter in the interest of the Association between the regular meetings of the Association; (7) in case of no quorum at any regular meeting of the Association, the

Board or the Executive Committee may elect officers for the ensuing year.

Section 2. Directors' Meetings. The meetings of the Board of Directors shall convene at the call of the Chairman of the Board, or at the written request of seven members of the Board, as often as the business of the corporation may require, by mailing to each director, at least three days prior to the date of such meeting, a written or printed notice, stating the time and place of such meeting.

Section 3. Quorum. A quorum shall consist of seven members of the Board of Directors, but directors less than a quorum may adjourn the meeting to a future date.

Section 4. Executive Committee. There shall be an Executive Committee of the Board the members of which, excepting its chairman, shall be appointed by the Board, to act between meetings of the Board and to have all powers of the Board in such intervals. The duties of the Executive Committee shall be administered in accordance with the policies and instructions of the Board of Directors. It shall be composed of seven persons resident within easy travel distance from the business office of the Association. A quorum shall consist of at least four members.

ARTICLE V DUTIES OF OFFICERS

Section 1. Officers. The officers of the Association shall be a President, three Vice Presidents, a Recording Secretary, a Treasurer, the chairmen of the Executive Committee of the Board of Directors and of the three standing committees of the Association provided in Article VI of the By-Laws. These officers shall be nominated in advance by a committee appointed by the President and shall be elected for one year at the annual meeting of the Association, and shall hold office until their successors are elected; additional nominations may, however, be made from the floor of the annual meeting of the Association.

Section 2. President. The President shall preside at the meetings of the Association and of the Board of Directors, and shall perform the duties usually devolving upon a presiding officer. In his absence the Vice President shall preside and in the absence of the Vice President, a pro-tempore Chairman shall be appointed by the members by regular vote of those present.

Section 3. Recording Secretary. The Recording Secretary shall keep a full and accurate report of the proceedings of the meetings of the Association and of all meetings of the Board of Directors.

Section 4. Treasurer. The Treasurer shall receive and hold, invest, or expend, under the direction of the Board of Directors and of the Executive Committee, all money paid to the Association; shall keep an exact account of receipts and expenditures, with vouchers for the latter; and shall render the accounts for the fiscal year ending March 1 to the Board of Directors. He shall give such bond for the faithful discharge of his duties as may be required by the Board of Directors.

Section 5. General Secretary. Whenever a General Secretary is appointed, the Board of Directors shall guide him in the extent and manner of his duties.

ARTICLE VI COMMITTEES

Section 1. Standing Committees. For the maintenance and continuity of the work of the Association and for the promotion of its work of investigation, there shall be the following standing committees, who shall report to the Association at its annual meeting, and in the interim

between annual meetings shall be responsible to the Board of Directors or to the Executive Committee of the Board of Directors: (A) *Program.* The Program Committee shall be responsible for the initiation and development of the programs of the Association, including convention plans, and such other matters as may properly be referred to it by the Board of Directors. (B) *Editorial.* The Editorial Committee shall serve in an advisory capacity in connection with RELIGIOUS EDUCATION, the Journal of the Association, making recommendations in matters of policy regarding the Journal. (C) *Research.* The Research Committee shall promote research in religious education.

Section 2. The chairmen of each of these three committees shall be ex-officio members of each of the three committees.

Section 3. The standing committees shall be expected to act until their successors are appointed and have assumed their duties.

Section 4. Further Committees. The Association in annual convention may provide for its own committees or may direct the Board to provide further standing committees, or the Board, *ad interim*, may appoint such other committees of the Association as it may deem best in carrying out the policies determined by the Association.

ARTICLE VII AMENDMENT OR ALTERATION OF BY-LAWS

Section 1. Amendment. These By-Laws may be modified, amended, or altered at any annual meeting, or at any adjourned session of such annual meeting.

BOOK REVIEWS AND NOTES

CHRISTIAN THINKING

BENNETT, JOHN C., *Social Salvation*. *Scribners*, 1935, 222 pages, \$2.00.

GRANT FREDERICK C., *Frontiers of Christian Thinking*. *Willett, Clark*, 1935, 179 pages, \$2.00.

NIEBUHR, H. R., PAUCK, W., and MILLER, F., *The Church Against the World*. *Willett, Clark*, 1935, 156 pages, \$2.00.

TITTLE, E. F., *A Way to Life*. *Holt*, 1935, 183 pages, \$1.75.

VAN DUSEN, HENRY P., *God in These Times*. *Scribners*, 1935, 194 pages, \$2.00.

It is not many years since religious leaders were in an apologetic frame of mind: books on religion were camouflaged under non-religious titles; theological terminology was daintily eschewed; the white flag was out lest men of science or social idealism should think theology was to be injected as a troubler of Israel. But despite the good-natured armistice, Israel encountered trouble from other sources. The backwash of the glorious war for human freedom sucked away the optimistic structures of confidence; and the economic depression threw up before a self-satisfied world the flotsam of a wrecked economic philosophy. The depth of the consequent disillusionment demanded a profounder statement of Christian idealism than had been forthcoming; and fortunately the challenge has been met by a more thoroughgoing examination of the assumptions of our "Christian" thought and practice.

In part the way to new levels of thought has been torn open by broadsides of withering fire from disillusioned critics. Such an attack is presented in the symposium by Richard Niebuhr, Pauck and Miller. Here the call is away from entangling alliances with that world of modern thought which cut itself off from self-criticism by accepting assumptions which fed its own ego; such ideas as that man's highest reaches of imagination are to be greeted as Deity, or that human agencies of religion must serve the current culture by insinuating itself into the confidence of the powerful, or that Jesus is the bearer of our values and that in doing our best we are following him. But to what are we called? To a world of values that transcends us so completely that we cannot attain unto it, and must recognize our failure as a condition of its making itself known to us, as God shows it forth in revelation. The negative protest is here stated with commanding power; the clear positive implications are not worked out. Yet the slap in the face may bring us to our senses when mild-mannered suggestions cannot.

Others have long sensed the hiatus between Christians' profession and their practice; but

feel that people must be led by understanding steps to get a clearer vision of the Christian hope for mankind. They feel that a slap is perhaps necessary in disciplining an unruly and perverse modern culture; but that when the shock has passed, education will still be needed. And so for them Christianity must present the means of transition from the evil present to the ideal. These means they suggest with varying degrees of caution and emancipation.

While the sermon is always closer to the layman's shore than is the lecture, one still feels that the one preacher in this group has held on a little too long to shibboleths that have lost their meaning for the critical minds of our time. Dr. Tittle's style suggests a caution foreign to the man; and one could wish a firmer statement of the badly needed insights which he gives into faith, and freedom, and social ethics, and the way of peace. Dean Grant's little volume is alike in sympathetic mood; but the incisiveness, the frank misgivings, and the forceful plea for Christian reunion (the best statement of this problem and its basic principles the present reviewer has seen), and for faith in the Church and in the possibilities of a creative Christianity that goes beyond the Man of Nazareth to find the Christ,—these notes lend power to a presentation grounded in careful treatment of the historical foundations of our Christian fellowship.

Two younger men have caught the virus of the critical emancipation, but have felt the need to go beyond to clear intelligible platforms for the Christian life. Dr. Van Dusen has arrested attention before this by his keen-pointed pen dipped in a purple ink of regal style. Few know the foibles of the academic mind as well as he, and yet he dares to trust that intelligence can bring us to a firmer ground for faith. The great abstractions of the modern mind have been its great undoing; but in their place there still can come the clear grasp of God: God the primal fact of life and not a "factor," God the manifoldly known, and God the guide of human history. Lest this too be called abstraction, the reader should see two discussions of specific issues: of communism, and of compromise. In Bennett's book—the first from a promising scholar—concrete issues are the stock in trade: war, economic anarchy, desensitized wealth, the irrelevance of Jesus, the ascetic yet inclusive church, the loss of faith in progress, the limitations of God. The extremely valuable schematic outlines of such problems, wrought with a realistic flavor that betrays no cant, make the book an admirable guide for groups that want to discuss the Christian way of life in concrete terms.

Taken as a group, these books herald a new alliance of philosophic insight and social pas-

sion: a method of attack which bids fair to sharpen the Christian contribution to a world caught in a chaos of warring idealisms.

The questions which they raise are those which lie at the roots of a philosophy of religious education: questions which religious educators themselves evaded because of the stock of common phrases which numbed the pains of thought. For where a common vocabulary is shared by a group, it tends to obscure the problems which words have "solved," and leaves the group a prey to superficial thought. This is why a challenge like *The Church Against the World* is so valuable. Here Dr. Pauck analyzes the forces behind our contemporary intellectual assumptions, which rest on a basic confidence in the adequacy of our human resources and a corresponding neglect of any belief in God. Religious educators will be concerned with Mr. Miller's attack on John Dewey as the apostle of nationalism. But unfortunately Mr. Miller has misunderstood the significance of Dewey's idea of "imagination" so that this section loses much of its force as a warning against absorbing Christianity into contemporary American culture. The issue is more clearly put in Richard Niebuhr's essay in the same volume.

A similar critique is carried through with remarkably precise analysis in Van Dusen's book. The modern problem is here reduced to three phases: modern life with its advance in effective mastery over nature accompanied by the tragic failures of the World War, the Depression, and the blatancy of jazz; modern thought using its refined tools to make philosophy supinely "respectable" instead of radical, and the modern mood, self-assured on the surface and bewildered underneath. This sadening spectacle owes its appearance to three fundamental errors. The first is the identification of nature as known to science with ultimate reality. The second is the divorce of our thought of God from our social consciousness and the consequent denial of His rule over human society. The third is the distorted estimate of man by virtue of his abstraction from the forces on which he is dependent. The Church has fallen in with this modern temper and consequently lost its power of criticism. (On this point Niebuhr, Miller, Pauck, Van Dusen, and Bennett are all agreed). It must recover its sense of God's transcendent power or fail.

Bennett's analysis is more concrete and its intent is somewhat different. He is concerned to examine the social ethical problems confronting Christian men and to penetrate beyond mere *obiter dicta* to basic religious assumptions for concrete programs of reform. This is seen in his statement of three half-truths in thought about human salvation: "that individuals can rise above any combination of social circumstances," "that since individuals control institutions and systems it is enough to change individuals," and "that you can change society without changing individuals." He does not believe that the teachings of Jesus furnish an adequate program for modern social reform, but must be reinterpreted from their apocalyp-

tic setting into a view which accepts "responsibility for long run structural social consequences." On the other hand, Bennett believes in the intrinsic worth of the present, whatever the future may bring, and though he holds that "the only perfect fulfillment of Jesus' expectation" would be beyond history, he feels that we must not depend too much on that. At bottom a program of Christian social action depends on God's being at work in the world through processes of creation, persuasion, inevitable judgment and healing. In general this final position of Bennett's is shared by Grant and Tittle.

The issue is becoming clear, and cuts to the heart of religious education. On what does Christian reconstruction of society rest: on God's transcendent action reaching into the world from beyond man; or on man's embodiment of the divine spirit in his own best ideals and judgments? It is difficult to see what the educator could do under the former assumption except to create crises wherein people would be driven to seek God (somewhat as in the old program of inducing an acute sense of sin). That there are perils in the other alternative no philosophically minded educator will deny; but are not the perils the price of our limited powers and must we not face them as we struggle on with humility and courage and a chastened confidence?—E. E. Aubrey.

* * *

WRITTEN IN THE WORKSHOP

BANG, E. E., Leathercraft for Amateurs.
VAN CLEVE, KATE, Hand Loom Weaving for Amateurs.

MANZONI, PETER, Metalcraft for Amateurs.
Beacon Press, 1935, about 128 pages, \$1.00.

These are the first three books of a new series on handicrafts. The Fellowcrafters Guild of Boston University developed, as an opportunity for creative teaching, classes in towns near Boston in the creative crafts and arts. The response was enthusiastic, and as a result the Fellowcrafters Guild set to work to prepare simple texts. These are the first three. Others to follow immediately deal with braiding and knotting, with linoleum engraving and printing, and with creative design.

Each of these books presupposes no information or technical skill on the part of the reader. Step by step he is carried forward in his craft, guided by the most explicit directions and well-drawn illustrations. With an eye to economy and wider usefulness, the authors have suggested only those materials and tools which are inexpensive. In a month's spare time any capable adult could master these techniques, and thereby fit himself to lead a youth group. The possibilities of creative leadership opened up through this new series becomes at once evident.—Frank P. Hudson.

* * *

ON JESUS

KERN, PAUL B., *The Basic Beliefs of Jesus*.
Cokesbury, 1935, 247 pages.

SHARMAN, HENRY B., *Jesus as a Teacher*.
Harpers, 1935, 171 pages, \$2.00.
Bishop Kern's *Basic Beliefs of Jesus* com-

prise the most recent Cole Lectures delivered at Vanderbilt University. The purpose of the book is to examine the assumptions upon which Jesus' life was based. What was Jesus' philosophy of life? The answer lies in Jesus' own life. His basic beliefs concern personality and its interaction in a personal universe. The sacredness of human personality evolved into a program which is creative and expresses itself in the eternal search for God. "Jesus is the avenue to God." He "lived in God." This position is as old as the Gospel of John, and the author presents it with force and vigor.

Dr. Sharman's previous books at once recommend his new volume. This volume is a life of Jesus made up from the Synoptic Gospels according to the American Revised Version. It is one of the many modern attempts to unify the Synoptic Gospels in an easily read, connected story. This is done in Book I. Book II, *The Record of John*, has the subtitle of "Philosophy and Psychology of Religion." The Fourth Gospel is condensed into fifteen pages bringing out points divergent from the Synoptic account. The book is a veritable work of art, and, with the exception of a two page prologue, it lets the Gospels speak for themselves.—C. A. Hawley.

* * *

ALLEN, HENRY E., *The Turkish Transformation*. University of Chicago Press, 1935, 251 pages, \$2.50.

Turkey has replaced the fez with the hat. This gesture reveals a new attitude to life. Addressing his fellow countrymen in 1927, Mustapha Kemal said: "Gentlemen, it was important to remove the fez which sat on our heads like a symbol of ignorance, of fanaticism, of hatred against progress and civilization, and in its place to put the customary hat, head-dress of the entire civilized world, and to show thereby among other things that no difference in manner of thought existed between the Turkish nation and the great family civilization." This indicates the spirit and purpose which animates the new Turkey, under the guidance of a forward-looking minority who are resolved that their native land shall take its place among the progressive nations of the world.

Consequently, this country furnishes one of the most interesting laboratories in which are being worked out experiments in economic, social, and religious reconstruction through a supervised "cross-fertilization" of cultures. The leaders are endeavoring to combine the best of their former civilization, after freeing it from the incubus of Mohammedan traditionalism, with the scientific, progressive and energetic spirit of the West, which they are seeking to isolate from its Christian accompaniment, and thus to usher the country into a new era of national solidarity and efficiency. This is to be accomplished mainly through a state-controlled system of education covering all the fields and activities of life. It is this general policy which has cramped the freedom of mission schools.

The author, who has familiarized himself with his topic through two visits to the coun-

try and by acquaintance with a wide range of literature, has managed to maintain an unbiased attitude toward issues that are loaded with passion and prejudice. It is this which wins the reader's confidence. We recommend this book highly to those interested in the process of culture transfusion and the quickening of national life.—Archibald G. Baker.

* * *

BENGTSON, NELS A., and VAN ROYEN, WILLEM, *Fundamentals of Economic Geography*. Prentice Hall, 1935, 802 pages, \$4.25.

The authors have written this book on the assumption that geography should be a basic science for all college students, and that the study of geography should be integrated completely with the social sciences.

This underlying purpose has determined both content and method. The facts are presented wherever possible in their cause and effect relationships, with particular reference in each case to the bearing of situations upon human life. Why are some races more stimulated towards progress than other races? The answer lies in climate, wet or dry, hot or cold, high or low. The effect upon man of agricultural products, of the distribution of metals, of the consequent development of economic products and manufactures, are all involved in the answer. Business becomes, then, "a form of a public trust," a challenge to cooperative endeavor in an age of increased leisure for the improvement of the mind of man.

After thoughtfully reading a book like this, one is convinced of the initial contention of the authors, that here is a subject which social science majors especially need.—P. H. Wright.

* * *

BINING, A. C. and D. H., *Teaching the Social Studies in Secondary Schools*. McGraw-Hill, 1935, 417 pages, \$3.00.

The social sciences include history, civics, political science, economics, sociology, problems of democracy, geography—those studies which contribute to wholesome participation in the social order. All the modern methods of teaching these materials are presented in detail—the textbook and recitation method, the project and problem methods, and supervised study. The socialized recitation is discussed, laboratory methods for the social studies, teaching by units, correlation and integration of learning, methods of teaching current events, written work, visual aids to teaching, dramatization, tableaux and music and debate. 30 pages are taken with tests and measurements of the results of learning. This is an exceedingly useful textbook.

While religion is not mentioned among the subjects of discussion, it will yield to the same types of treatment. The study of a book of this sort would prove of great value to any teacher of religion who treats of the adolescent age.—P. H. Wright.

* * *

BOWER, WILLIAM CLAYTON, *Editor, The Church at Work in the Modern World*. U. of Chicago Press, 1935, 304 pages, \$2.00.

Here is a co-operative volume which, literally, is indispensable to all those who would under-

stand the problems, duties and opportunities now faced by the Protestant churches of America. The points of view, or the philosophy, of the essayists—William Clayton Bower, Edward Scribner Ames, A. G. Baker, Shirley Jackson Case, W. E. Garrison, C. T. Holman, S. C. Kincheloe and Shaile Mathews—may be described as eminently social, scientific and “modern.” The essays are at once critical and constructive, candid and helpful.

The central question discussed is this: Why has Protestantism lost its hold on so many important groups in the population—particularly wage-workers and under-privileged elements—and what can it do to recover its influence and prestige, and to become a power for good—for peace, justice, humanity and genuine progress?

The essayists offer no detailed program of reconstruction, but they present scores of valuable and sound suggestions. The field they cover is as wide as the interests of the church and the requirements of what they frankly say is a difficult transitional period.

Education, missions, community welfare, the function of the minister; service required by individuals; worship and symbolism; co-operation for certain general ends; the attitude of the churches to international peace, to social and economic reforms; the vital and highly controversial question of individual salvation versus direct efforts to change the environment that breeds evils and discords—these and other complex issues are discussed with remarkable breadth, vision and knowledge. The whole volume is alive and gripping.—*Victor S. Yarros.*

* * *

BOWIE, W. R., *The Renewing Gospel*. *Scribners*, 1935, 296 pages, \$2.00.

This book is an expansion of the Lyman Beecher Lectures on Preaching, given at Yale Divinity School, April, 1935. The author is the rector of Grace Church, New York City, and has published numerous books. Instead of lecturing on sermon construction and preaching techniques, the attempt is to define the preacher's gospel. The ideal preacher is described as one who is “fortified by a great fellowship” and “overshadowed also by God.” His audience, for whom the writer seems most concerned, is the “decent, godless people,” with little reference to the millions of unemployed or those of every nation who are crushed and hopeless. The gospel is an ancient story to be renewed and re-applied. An apologetic tone pervades the book, and the last chapter is a wistful desire for the time “when the new prophets come.” Instead of asserting self-revealing truths and recalling the ever-renewing faith of great souls who have led and lead to-day in the Christian church, the writer assumes a defensive-defeatist attitude. He would probably deny this, but the lectures make the reviewer feel that Mr. Bowie sees the ark in danger and has put out his hand to save it. Apology can not reveal dynamic reality.—*E. J. Chave.*

* * *

BROOKS, WILLIAM ALLAN, *The Student's Handbook*. *National Library Press*, 110 West 42nd St., New York. 1935, 318 pages. This manual, for high school and college

students, covers the essential phases of educational life at which students can be helped to more effective methods of work. What are the principles underlying scholarship, and how can they be employed to increase student efficiency? What are the best methods to prepare for examinations, and how should one write an examination? Shall a student take notes? When, why, and how many? In what form? How shall he most wisely use reference books? Should he seek part time employment? By what methods? What kinds of work are open to students? How shall he best take exercise, and what are the rules of student health? Where can he get scholarships or student loans? An interesting chapter gives the A.B.C. Shorthand System “complete in twelve easy lessons,” requiring a very few hours to master. Another useful chapter directs attention to possible vocations for graduates, and makes suggestions about “holding that first job!”

This is a stimulating, and reasonably complete, manual.—*Frank P. Hudson.*

* * *

BUCKHAM, J. W., *Christianity and Personality*. *Round Table*, 1936, 192 pages, \$2.00.

Dr. Buckham has been writing books, and good ones, since 1902 in his field of Christian Theology. He is professor in the Pacific School of Religion in this Department and is doing a constructive piece of work in that central training school for ministers of the western United States. He is now seventy-two years of age, but let us hope this is not his final contribution.

Dr. Buckham is well known as an idealist. He is far from being an apologist, except in the best sense of that much maligned word. He insists that formulation must follow experience, which means that interpretation (theology, the idea of God) must follow and be secondary to the direct apprehensions of God in experience.

Not every one will agree that impartation is superior to creativity, for not a few esteem that creativity is the finest power of personality and that impartation is inherent in it. However, with Dr. Buckham's general thesis—that personality is Christianity's very heart—there will be hearty agreement. And there will likewise be general agreement with the cogently expressed summary of his whole approach as given in the book's concluding sentence—“When personality is made central in philosophy, in theology, in ethics, above all in motive and conduct, others forms of reality and value take on larger meaning and fall into an ordered and progressive harmony.”

The book is “A Religious Book Club Selection,” which means it ought to have a wide reading, secure an intelligent consideration, and exert a profound influence on the thinking of America's spiritual leadership.—*W. A. Harper.*

* * *

CADMAN, S. PARKES, *Adventure for Happiness*. *Macmillan*, 1935, 312 pages, \$1.90.

In fifteen chapters America's most popular radio preacher combats the pessimism of our day. He finds, as every happy person knows, that happiness is the result of high adventure, and the higher and nobler the cause in which

the spirit of adventuresomeness occurs, the correspondingly higher and more satisfying is the result.

As you read the stately periods that constitute the three hundred pages and more of the book, two things constantly amaze you—the rare vocabulary of the man and his encyclopaedic knowledge. His language is ornate, chaste, unusual. He does not strive for the simple word, but for the word that expresses the exact shade of meaning he desires to convey, nor does he ever seem to be aiming at the false garnish of fine writing. His acquaintance with literature, with music, with art, simply beggars description.

Many books have been written on happiness, and many more will be written. This book deserves high rank among them. From its opening "It is impossible" to its concluding "There shall come in God's good time 'a stather Eden back to men' than they have ever dreamt," this book bristles with challenging epigram and gripping periods. It must be read to be appreciated.—*W. A. Harper.*



CARRINGTON, HEREWARD, *Loaves and Fishes*, *Scribners*, 1935, 274 pages, \$2.00.

The interpretation of psychical phenomena is always an intriguing subject. Mr. Carrington, who is Director of the American Psychical Institute, who has spent thirty-five years examining phenomena of this nature, who has continuously exposed the palpably false, is convinced that beyond normal human nature there is a super-normal, which in nature is essentially one with the normal. In this realm visions and mystical understandings occur, apparitions are seen, the dead come into intelligent contact with the living, the spirit world breaks through upon listening humanity.

He has examined the life of Jesus, based upon the gospel records, and attempts to interpret Jesus's life in terms of the super-normal. He accepts the miracles, therefore (most of them), as valid accounts, shows how the same acts are entirely possible today, and are constantly being performed. The physical resurrection he denies, but defends the idea of a spiritual resurrection. He explains the apparitions of Jesus observed by his followers, who saw him just as modern people see spirit forms under favorable conditions. On the basis of Jesus' psychical resurrection, he sees a future life for all.

Mr. Carrington's book is the clearest presentation of the views of believers in psychical phenomena this reviewer has seen.—*W. B. Meyerson.*



DAWSON, CARL A. and GETTYS, WARNER E., *An Introduction to Sociology*. *Ronald Press*, 1935. \$4.00.

This volume of nearly 900 pages is a revised and greatly improved edition of a valuable work, first published six years ago. Professors Dawson and Gettys, benefitting by invited criticisms and suggestions from teachers and students, have produced a work which is very much alive and which draws many of its examples and illustrations from raw and bleeding reality—war, conquest, peace movements, party

warfare, progressive legislation, reform programs, and the like. The treatment is, of course, scientific and impartial. Dogmatism is avoided, although personal opinions are expressed to which exception may be taken. A way has been shown in this comprehensive volume to the dramatization and revivification of the science of sociology.—*Victor S. Yarros.*



FERGUSON E. MORRIS, *Historic Chapters in Christian Education in America*. *Revell*, 1935, 192 pages, \$1.50.

This posthumous volume by Dr. Ferguson tells the story of how the democratic, interdenominational, International Sunday School Association became the ecclesiastically controlled International Council of Religious Education. It is unkind to assign motives, but inasmuch as Dr. Ferguson says that the higher professional training of the denominational leaders led them to seek changes in educational procedures through corporate action, perhaps it would not be unfair to state that not a few leaders in the old territorial organization are convinced that in the old International Sunday School Association, the denominations saw the rising sun of Christian Union and took steps to forestall it. Be that as it may, it is well known that the present International Council belongs to the ecclesiastics and not to the people, even the State Councils before receiving accreditation finding it necessary to prove that the denominations accept them as the accredited agencies of their interdenominational work in religious education. Perhaps this is desirable. Perhaps it was inevitable. Nevertheless those who know the throttling control of ecclesiastical domination cannot but feel that something eminently worth while passed out of American religious life in the merger of 1922 of the International Sunday School Association with the Sunday School Council of Evangelical Denominations into the present International Council of Religious Education. The difference is fairly epitomized in Marion Lawrence, the last general Secretary of the old and Hugh Magill the first General Secretary of the new. Both were excellent men, but their excellency lay in different directions. Lawrence was the warmly religious leader. Magill was the intellectually competent educator. It may be that the chartering of the old International by Congress was the straw that broke the camel's back—"with this step," says Ferguson, "the International filled up the sum of its provocations"—but the facts admit at least of a different interpretation.

But the water has passed over the dam and how it was done is told with glosses by the man who after eighteen years as the General Secretary of the New Jersey State Sunday School Association and service later in Maryland, Delaware, and Massachusetts in similar capacity, found a work more to his liking as Educational Secretary of the Presbyterian Church, U.S.A. In this capacity in 1910 he organized the Sunday School Council of Evangelical Denominations, which by a rare determination and skillful use of church money has become itself the organized movement of religious education in America. In this organi-

zation, naively confesses Fergusson, "For the first time in the history of the North American Sunday School cause the denominations as such were acting together" and "the denominational-thinking men of the Council quietly but firmly took the helm," while "the vast Sunday School constituency had no thought of schism among the forces (the old International and Evangelical Denominations), much less of open war," until today the "International Council" has become the "rubber stamp" of its "Educational Commission," if not of the "Central Committee" of that group.

The book falls into two parts—The American Sunday School Movement, and The Rise of the Church School, but chief interest centers in the first 110 pages even as Dr. Fergusson would have wished. This does not mean however that part two is unimportant. On the other hand it contains matter of great value, particularly the "secret" approach of Mrs. J. Woodbridge Barnes to the matter of graded lessons. The intelligent reader, however, can never forget the pioneering work of Scribner's as publishers of the Blakeslee lessons nor of William Rainey Harper in the Constructive Series, The Institute of Sacred Literature, and the Religious Education Association, nor of such non-evangelical groups as the Unitarians. This part of the book should be read in connection with the contributions of Trumbull, of Sampey, and of Lankard as well as of Betts and Brown to the history of the American Sunday School curriculum.

Dr. Fergusson never grasped the idea of the entire Church in its total program as a "School of Christian Living." To his mind Christian education was the process by which persons are prepared for membership in the Church—a process of indoctrination. There is scant evidence that he would be happy in the present effort of the International Council to build a curriculum on the experiences persons are actually having, nor is it certain that the ecclesiastics of that body fully comprehend the principles they have enunciated.

However, here is a book by a leader in the fray, posthumous it is true, but interpretative of the motives that energized action and therefore thoroughly worth while, even if the facts set forth are capable of less palatable interpretation. Therefore, let us read and then "proceed upon" our "uncharted way."—W. A. Harper.

* * *

GOWEN, HERBERT H., *A History of Religion*. Morehouse, 1934, 698 pages, \$3.50.

Dr. Gowen has had a religious purpose in view in writing this history of religion, as well as a historical purpose: that "there may be made plainer to the eyes of my readers the vision of a divine purpose slowly but surely being realized, through which the human spirit is being led toward the goal set forth from all eternity." His work is divided into five books, dealing respectively with the principles of primitive religion, with the primitive religions themselves, with the state religions of antiquity, with the religions of the orient, and with the development through Judaism to Christianity. The story of

Islam is included as an interlude in the forward march of Christianity.

Dr. Gowen has written a descriptive history, with interpretations at every step. In the treatment of non-Christian religious movements he has been objective and descriptive, not antagonistic nor dogmatic. The book becomes, therefore, all the more suitable for thoughtful study.—J. R. Higdon.

* * *

HARRIS, CHARLES W., *The Hebrew Heritage*. Abingdon, 1935, 370 pages, \$2.50.

Beginning with the early culture of mankind in pre-historic times, moving step by step through the religion and culture of the nomad, Semite, Sumerian, and the Egyptian, Dr. Harris traces the inheritance of the early Hebrews. Taking up the genesis of the Hebrew nation, the influence of geography and climate, of inter-racial contacts and struggles, of the inter-penetration of cultures, he shows how the Hebrews slowly evolved under pressures from without and from within. He carries through the Old Testament period, interpreting developments step by step, and then describes the development of religious thought among the Persians and Greeks, and the development of religious ideology among the Hebrews. His book is a treasure house of materials basic to an understanding of the Hebrew religion.—Frank P. Hudson.

* * *

HAYDON, A. EUSTACE, Editor, *Modern Trends in World-Religions*. U. of C. Press, 1935, 255 pages, \$2.50.

The twenty-four chapters in this book are lectures delivered under the Haskell Foundation on Hinduism, Confucianism, Buddhism, Judaism, Islam, and Christianity, by specialists in these various religions. The book is written in four parts: I, World-Religions and Modern Scientific Thinking; II, World-Religions and Modern Social-Economic Problems; III, World-Religions and Inter-Cultural Contacts; and IV, The Task of Modern Religion.

The many people who have traditional Western ideas of other religions—which have developed a distinct prejudice—will find here much food for thought and new conceptions of the search of other peoples for God. . . . "It is the duty of religious-minded people not to stand apart in their differences but to stand together and to work for the greater glory of God and the greater happiness of mankind."—A. J. W. Myers.

* * *

KAGAWA, TOYOHICO, *Meditations on the Cross*. Willett, Clark, 1935, 211 pages, \$1.50.

As Kagawa meditates upon Christ's acceptance of the cross, he sees it as an event which grew out of the consciousness of Jesus in dealing with the contemporary social situation. "As a proletarian of the proletarians, the most oppressed of all" (vii) Jesus found rejection inevitable while working in the interest of the dispossessed and despised classes. The Fourth Gospel, which Kagawa regards as "largely a compilation of the confessions of officials who crucified Jesus and afterward repented of it" (vi) is given large credence in reconstructing the social scene.

But far deeper in his meditation, is the conviction that the cross is the highest expression of a kind of life rooted in God and indispensable to our age. Only as individuals feel a sense of responsibility for the whole community, and are willing to sacrifice and suffer to heal its ills, can our world be saved.

This emphasis comes at a time when many nations are making the state supreme. Individuals count for nothing save as they serve the state. The cross retains the conviction that each individual is of infinite worth, finding his life by giving it for the common good. It is love in action.—*Roland W. Schloerb.*

* * *

LIGON, ERNEST M., *The Psychology of Christian Personality*. Macmillan, 1935, 393 pages. \$3.00.

Professor Ligon presents in an entertaining way many of the best results of the study of people and of religion. His book also carries with it a religious spirit not always found even in sermons. The reader finds help on many puzzling questions such as the understanding and treatment of fears.

The volume has two phases, one of which is the statement of sound results of experiment and study carried on by many workers over the last number of years. This is well done. The other phase is a treatment of the Beatitudes in an attempt to show that the principles and methods are deduced from them. This attempt leads to interpretations of the Beatitudes which make textual students pull wry faces and utter exclamations. The book would have been stronger if its findings had been presented on the basis of their own worth, unbolstered by forced scriptural sanctions. But the whole tenor of the book is helpful.—*Frank Meyerson.*

* * *

MAIER, WALTER A., *For Better, Not for Worse*. Concordia, 1935, 504 pages, \$2.00.

In this manual of *Christian* matrimony, Dr. Maier, a well-known Professor in Concordia Seminary, brings us back again to the fundamental sacredness of the marriage relationship and to its essential purposes. He bases his discussion upon the Scriptures, which rest back upon the morality of the ancient Hebrews and upon the teachings of Jesus.

The fundamental purposes of marriage are companionship and love between husband and wife, the birth of healthy children, and the rearing of children in the Christian way of life.

Dr. Maier would have none of birth-control. He believes that it is unnecessary, that it is morally wrong, and that its results would bring disaster upon families and upon the nation. Divorce is, of course a blight, the antidote to which is Christian marriage based upon careful pre-marital selection and upon love. He is not in favor of extra-family careers for married women, unless it be to provide a way out of an otherwise impossible economic situation. Dr. Maier has written a challenging book. With its ideals everyone will agree. Some will doubt whether the ideals can all be attained.—*Frank Meyerson.*

MILNER, JEAN S., *The Sky is Red*. Bobbs-Merrill, 1935, 332 pages, \$2.50.

"When it is evening, ye say, it will be fair weather: for the sky is red. . . . ye can discern the face of the sky; but can ye not discern the signs of the times?"

Dr. Milner, a minister of Indianapolis, interprets the signs of the time. "In too many places," he says, "we are attempting to do an impossible thing—present a mediaeval system of thought and belief to a modern world. We must rationalize our faith or our children will have no faith."

The first two-thirds of the book interprets the historical background of our inherited faith, in terms of modern historical criticism. A most significant chapter shows that the religion of Jesus was a clear-cut faith based on simple principles of rational living, challenging man to live his best. After Jesus' death his religion fell gradually into the hands of systematizers who made of it a fixed thing. It needs to be reinterpreted, modernized, to meet the demands of modern folk.

The second part of the book surveys the world issues Christianity must face in the fields of belief, social justice, and war, shows how the trends of our times are creating a crisis which only Christian living and Christian social action can meet. A book to make one think.—*L. T. Hites.*

* * *

MINAKER, F. C., Editor, *One Thousand Ways to Make \$1000*. Dartnell, 1935, 472 pages, \$2.50.

That "every story in this book is true" is the guarantee of the publisher. Mr. Minaker must have followed up thousands of clues to obtain the wealth of "success" material which enters into the book. Story follows after story, how the Wanamaker business started—on a shoestring; how J. C. Penny made his first thousand; how John H. Patterson had to fight to begin his cash register business. Hundreds of new and small businesses are featured—how a family got on its feet manufacturing and selling tomato juice; how a boy built up a service-industry caring for electric motors in small manufacturing plants; how the MacIntryes make a good living with a second-hand magazine and book service.

Guiding principles for the establishment of small industries are carefully stated: the qualities of money; the essentials of salesmanship; the desirability of study to equip oneself; the problems involved in securing, defending and selling patents; what to do with surplus money.

An excellent chapter is given to the problem of raising money for charity. Reasons for present difficulties are cited, and then a score or more of suggestions of different ways are cited, all of which have proved successful somewhere.

Three appendices tell (1) the essentials of operating budgets for various businesses, (2) sources of supply for nearly every conceivable need, and (3) a very extensive bibliography of periodicals and books covering everything from bee-keeping and horticulture to tea-room and restaurant management.

The book is so interesting it is difficult to

lay it down. Since "every story in the book is true" it should prove helpful and encouraging to many classes of readers.—*Bertrand C. Stone.*

* * *

MOULTON, HAROLD G., *Income and Economic Progress*. *Brookings Institute*, 1935. 200 pages. \$2.00.

This volume is the last in the timely and remarkable series of studies devoted to an analysis of the distribution of wealth and income in the United States in relation to true economic wellbeing and progress. No intelligent person should attempt to discuss our present situation, or the depression and means of sound recovery, without a careful study of this valuable series.

Not all of its data are unquestioned, and not all of its conclusions have gone, or will go, unchallenged. But nine-tenths of its contribution to the best scientific discussion of our period will withstand the closest scrutiny.

Prof. Moulton and his associates have no preconceived dogmas to defend. They were anxious to "get understanding," and to throw light on the causes of our so-called business cycle, our boom periods and our crashes and breakdowns, and to suggest permanent remedies or preventives. The final and important recommendation is, briefly, this—that mass production must be accompanied by mass consumption; that, therefore, the purchasing power of the consuming public must be steadily increased; that present or recent palliatives are not calculated to achieve this indispensable end; that even successful efforts of unions to raise wages will not do much good, and that the only way to bring about a proper distribution of national income, and thus increase mass consumption, is that of general price reductions. The automobile industry is offered as an illustration of the universality of the benefits of price reduction. Monopoly is short-sighted in stubbornly maintaining prices. It defeats its own ends in the long run. Price reduction is not incompatible with fair profits, and there is nothing wrong with the "profit motive" as such, provided capital and management are enlightened and reasonable.

Radical schools will quarrel with this central conclusion. Professor Moulton should have dealt with radical objections in a special chapter. He knows what these are. Perhaps in a later study he will show that mass consumption and stable prosperity are possible under a system which rests on interest, rent, and substantial profits.—*Victor S. Yarros.*

* * *

MUNKRES, ALBERTA, *Which Way for Our Children?* *Scribners*, 1936, 197 pages, \$2.00.

This is an excellent handbook for parents and teachers seeking guidance in the difficult problem of making religious ideas meaningful to children. Dr. Munkres, of Cornell College, Iowa, deals with concepts of God, Jesus, the Bible, prayer, group worship and death in a realistic and very undogmatic way. Different points of view are recognized, analyzed and the consequences for the child in each case, are

clearly stated. There is no attempt to impose any theological or pedagogical patterns and Dr. Munkres makes a frank acknowledgment that there are "no well-defined paths leading assuredly to the goal, and great is the diversity of opinion among those who would offer advice."

In addition to a skillful discussion of the theories underlying the religious educator of children, the writer takes a number of cases under each concept—illustrating successes or failures in handling children relative to the situations in which the concepts were involved. Brief suggestive comments are made on books which might further a parent's or teacher's understanding of these religious ideas and how to mediate them to children. The test of method and content of teaching at every step, is the experience of the child. The author is a practical teacher who is not as much concerned with what it is possible to teach a child as with the question—what is most valuable to a child in his present state and for developing life. The book is exceptionally free from evasion and platitudinous abstractions and should prove stimulating to every worker in the field of elementary religious education. Most preachers could use it to great advantage. The book is dedicated to Mrs. S. L. Fahs, who has done some fine pioneering work in this same area.—*E. J. Chave.*

* * *

NIEBUHR, REINHOLD, *An Interpretation of Christian Ethics*. *Harper*, 1935, 244 pages, \$2.00.

The author of this book—the fifth so far to appear—enjoys a high reputation as one of the young religious thinkers of our time. Called to Union Seminary from a very successful pastorate in Detroit, extending over some thirteen years, he has as Professor of Applied Christianity become steadily more and more popular as a student leader. For these reasons the reviewer hesitates to say that he doubts if this new book adds any new ideas to those for which Dr. Niebuhr is already accepted as sponsor.

The book is difficult to read and understand. Simple words for simple ideas do not characterize it. For example, here is a typically grandiloquent morsel—"Modern naturalism, whether liberal or radical, is a secularized version of the naturalistic element in historic Hebrew-Christian mythology," and here is another—"Mysticism is really a self-devouring rationalism which begins by abstracting rational forms from concrete reality and ends by painting an ultimate reality beyond all rational forms." To those brought up on the rhetorical rule—"Use the simplest word the subject will bear,"—this book will appear needlessly erudite, not to say stilted.

These are the Walter Rauschenbusch Lectures for 1934. Rauschenbusch was a simple soul who believed devoutly in the social gospel. Colgate-Rochester Divinity School does well to perpetuate his memory with this lectureship. It is doubtful if the great "social gospel" would approve the "impossible possibility" set forth as the fundamental thesis of this book. Perhaps that is well. There should be some advance in our thinking. However, not a few

will dissent from the view that Jesus announced an impossible ethic.

Christian history reveals the progressive realization of his idealism. Christianity is never complete or perfect or final in any moment of time, but that does not mean its founder was an impossible dreamer. It means that his ethic is an enlarging one and only time to come can understand its progressiveness.

Dr. Niebuhr is what the reviewer would describe as an evolutionary theist, or perhaps he would better classify as a neo-supernaturalist. If he could just find room in his program of Christian evolution for the mystical utterances of the Holy Spirit, how easy everything would be, and simple language would be amply able to convey all such ideas!

Nevertheless, read the book. It is worth your while and effort.—*W. A. Harper.*

* * *

RUSSELL, BERTRAND, *Religion and Science*. Holt, 1936, 271 pages, \$2.00.

These essays are a vigorous defense of freedom of thought and expression. The author believes that not since 1660 has there been a greater threat to intellectual freedom than there is today. During the last four hundred years the representatives of religion have been the chief source of persecution. The notable conflicts between the church and such men as Copernicus, Galileo, Darwin, and the pioneers of scientific medicine, are presented with engaging clarity. The church has only slowly welcomed the new truth which science has made available. However, the author believes that "the warfare between science and Christian theology . . . is nearly ended," and he adds, "I think most Christians would admit that their religion is the better for it."

Today the threat against freedom comes from governments which are eager to avert the danger of anarchy and chaos. In their ardor to create social solidarity, they are using the method of the Inquisition, which is to promote truth by stating once for all what is true, and then punishing those who disagree. Against such intolerance, Mr. Russell registers his protest.—*Rolland W. Schloerb.*

* * *

SHUSTER, GEORGE N., *Like a Mighty Army: Hitler Versus Established Religion*. Appleton-Century, 1935, 280 pages, \$2.00.

The author, who styles himself a Christian (page 281), is convinced that the Hitler movement will inevitably, if unchecked, supplant the Protestant, Roman Catholic, and Jewish religions in Germany with Nazism.

The defeated, impoverished nation could not fight France or the depression, and found in Anti-Semitism "a madman's perfect alibi!" The author describes vividly the war on the Jew, the Protestant struggle, and Hitler's resistance to Rome. The stirring conclusion of the whole matter is this: "If for a few years the Church can be loyal to itself, preferring a thousand sacrifices to one compromise, there will be a resurrection of belief such as has not been witnessed in many hundreds of years" (page 281). The author suggests one way in which *all* can

help: Work for religious liberty in *all lands*.

One of Germany's basic principles is "the chosen race." Is this not fundamentally as erroneous when held by modern Christians as by ancient Jews? Mr. Shuster skates over the problem (page 7).

The author has some of an imaginative writer's high handed methods. One example will suffice: "The essence of the Reformation," he says, "may be described as perpetual reading of the Bible to the accompaniment of tears of contrition."—*A. J. W. Myers.*

* * *

SPERRY, WILLARD L., *What You Owe Your Child*. Harper, 1935, 154 pages.

The subtitle is "The Problem of Religion and Morals in the Modern Home"—a vital enough problem, surely. In the Preface the author says, "This book is the outcome of an evening spent at the Junior League in New York." He found, as have many others, that parents in all walks of life are intensely interested, and often perplexed, as to what to teach their children in religion. Beneath the surface, carefully enamelled over, is a longing for help. Fortunately religious education is now ready in a measure to meet this end.

In a very effective way, Dr. Sperry meets the stock reasons and alibis that parents advance for not teaching religion. The main intent of the book and all of its constructive suggestions are such that one would like to have parents everywhere read it.

With so much that is commendable, it is a great pity that the author goes out of his way to discredit progressive education—with which he is obviously out of touch. Progressive or common sense educators will smile at these criticisms, the opposite of the truth: That progressive education is equivalent to "projects"; "freedom [contrary to the teaching of progressive education] is a relative, not an absolute," thing (p. 79); "I object to the absence of discipline" (p. 79); "the child must have everything served to him in perfectly intelligible shape" (p. 139). In these criticisms he is, of course, allying himself with creative education, and should, therefore, be its advocate instead of adverse critic.

He gives his own ideas of what Bible stories should be taught to children, ignoring all the study and research that has been done by patient workers with children. One piece of advice is interesting: "I should read the stories without comment and without raising at first the critical questions with which they bristle" (p. 107). But where will he find children who will accept them without question? Surely not in the suburbs of Boston!

Church schools are far from what they ought to be but sentiments like these should tone them up: "The Sunday school is at best something to be passed through and graduated from" (p. 138); the alternatives before the Sunday school are, by implication, "giving children religious explanations" or "teaching children how to worship" (p. 126). No brief comments could much better reveal a complete misconception of religious education. Religious education is not confined to such an alternative. And why is

the Sunday school limited to "children?" There is no conception here of the school being the church engaged in the great work of its teaching ministry.

Sufficient proof of any assertion is the writer's own experiences: "I can only say that I began my Bible in that way." Though not so intended, the conclusion in thought is "and look at me!"

Perhaps the very fact that such misconceptions of religious and progressive education come from Divinity Halls where ministers are supposed to be prepared for teaching religion is one reason why church schools are so often far below what might be expected.—*A. J. W. Myers.*

* * *

STEPUN, FEDOR, *The Russian Soul and Revolution*. *Scribners*, 1935, 196 pages, \$1.50.

The author of this interesting and original book is a Russian exile and a former member of the faculty of Moscow University. His negative interpretation of the Russian revolution and the radical experiments in economics and politics, as in social realities, that followed the triumph of the Bolsheviks, may be questioned, but is worthy of serious attention.

He finds the true explanation of events in Russian history, mentality, geography, and national character. He is satisfied that the Bolshevik leaders do not know themselves, and that they are far more Slav, Russian and mystical $\frac{1}{2}$ in fact, *religious*—than they would ever admit. They use Marxian and Western terms, but they are really obeying the dictates of their own souls, and are, as Russia has been for ages, half barbarian and half holy.

Bolshevism itself is not atheistic. It is "demonic," but essentially based on faith, not on science. The "true soul of Russia" must conquer in the end, despite the Bolshevik educational system, the socialization of agriculture and industry, the suppression of all opposition. Man does not live by bread alone.—*Victor S. Yarros.*

* * *

STOREY, THOMAS A., *Principles of Hygiene*. *Stanford University Press*, 1935, 524 pages, \$3.50.

First written in 1924, now rewritten, Dr. Storey's book presents the fundamental principles of hygiene. In a later book, now in preparation, he will treat of practice.

The principles and practice of hygiene rest back upon biological origins. To considerable extent Dr. Storey is a hereditarian. He is interested in the total person, and therefore treats of mental health as well as physical, social health as well as individual. He considers the principles of hygiene which underlie the production of health, as well as its improvement and defense.

The treatment falls logically into two parts: *first*, those principles which may be termed "constructive," such as the hygiene of heredity, of nutrition and excretion, of rest and play and exercise and a wholesome outlook on life; *second*, principles of defensive hygiene, which consider the causes of disease, and suggest hygienic defenses. The causes of disease may be micro-organisms, or hereditary, or they may result from excesses of food, rest, play. In

immediate connection with the statement of principles are suggestions which lead toward practice.

Dr. Storey's book offers a useful tool to those engaged in human leadership in any field.—*Frank Hobson.*

* * *

STRANG, RUTH, *The Rôle of the Teacher in Personnel Work*. *Teachers College*, 1935, 417 pages.

Miss Strang would define personnel work broadly as bringing to bear on the student all the influences that will help him develop and apply his powers. Some of these influences can be wielded only by the specialist in physical or mental health, or by the administrator whose responsibility it becomes to make decisions. Effective counseling is based upon a diagnosis which becomes possible only through the administration of tests and the accumulation of many data.

Miss Strang would have the classroom teacher participate actively in the guidance process, the homeroom teacher and the club sponsor participate a little more specifically, always in cooperation with specialists. She would have every teacher learn the fundamental principles of personnel work, whether teacher or expert must carry them out, and to that end has written this book. It covers the whole problem of student adjustments, and the techniques of personnel work. In every step, the possibilities of teacher participation in the guidance program are featured.—*Frank Hobson.*

* * *

WELTON, THURSTON S., *The Modern Method of Birth Control*. *Black*, 1935, 159 pages, \$3.00.

Dr. Ogino of Japan and Dr. Knaus of Austria, working independently, and by different methods, discovered two facts about reproduction which have become the basis of modern birth control: (1) That the female ovum appears in the tubes from 12 to 16 days before menstruation and is capable of fertilization for not more than 24 hours; (2) That the male spermatozoon is actively capable of fertilizing the ovum for not more than two days after leaving the body of the male. These two facts, when associated, reveal a period of possible conception of not more than eight or nine days a month in regular cases. The remainder of the month is a "safe" period.

Dr. Welton has elaborated upon these facts in this book. After four introductory chapters on marriage and childbearing, the functions of the egg and male cells, menstruation, and motherhood, he launches into a discussion of how to apply the Ogino-Knaus method, and gives charts showing every conceivable type of situation. He is careful to state, in italics, that the method is *ninety-seven* percent reliable.—*Frank Hobson.*

* * *

WYAND, FRED B., Editor, *Religion and the Church Tomorrow*. *Cokesbury*, 1936, 222 pages, \$2.00.

This book is a symposium in which ten authors participate. They represent different communions and co-operative agencies within the

Protestant Church in the United States. Albert W. Beaven contributes a chapter on "The Need of Religion Tomorrow," Francis J. McConnell on "Its Social Content," Ray H. Abrams on "Its Pacific Goal," Karl R. Stoltz on "Its Contribution to Mental Health," John W. Shackford on "Its Christian Education Program," Jesse M. Bader on "Its Christianizing Quality," Lynn Harold Hough on "Those in the Pulpit," Roger W. Babson on "Those in the Pew," William H. Leach on "Its Administrative Technique," and Samuel McCrea Cavert on "Its Organic and Spiritual Unity." The editor writes the Introduction.

The book is of the conventional symposium type. There is no underlying philosophy relating the parts of the book to the current fundamental issues in regard to the nature of religion, theological point of view, or conception concerning the functional relation of the church to the social process. Such unity as exists consists in the fact that the authors recognize that the church is passing through a period of great social change and that the church must arouse itself to renewed energy if it is to meet the challenges of the future. As is usually the case in such symposia, there is a good deal of unevenness.

The book is popularly written and is evidently designed for a general audience. It contains a number of interestingly presented descriptions of the more recent trends in attitude and practice, together with some factual material. It leaves the reader with the feeling that the church has an important responsibility and opportunity in the future that lies immediately ahead, but it does not provide him with an organized system of ideas that may serve as fundamental guiding principles regarding the functioning of religion in contemporary society.

—William Clayton Bower.

Briefer Mention

BOKSER, BEN ZION, *Pharisaic Judaism in Transition*. Bloch, 1935, 195 pages, \$2.00.

When Jerusalem fell, in 70 A.D., five great movements of religious thought competed for the loyalty of the dispossessed Jews: Christianity, Essenism, Sadduceism, Zealotism, and Pharisaism. Of these, Pharisaism alone was able to offer the defeated Jews hope of a future which seemed acceptable to them. But Pharisaism had to be remodeled. A central figure in the process was Rabbi Eliezer b. Hyrcanus. In this study Dr. Bokser traces the development of R. Eliezer's thought, and the conflicts which flowed about him.



BOONE, W. C., *What God Hath Joined Together*. Broadman, 1935, 128 pages, \$1.00.

A Southern Baptist minister, happily married, the father of five children, each year gives a series of sermons dealing with some aspect of the home. He has drawn together twelve of these sermons, and offers them in this small volume. God's plan is a monogamous, permanent union, based on love, designed to

satisfy the hunger for love and to bring children into existence. Dr. Boone's book is simple, direct, forceful, and very suggestive.



BRAISTED, PAUL J., *Indian Nationalism and the Christian Colleges*. Association, 1935, 171 pages, \$1.50.

The former Director of Religious Work in Judson College, Rangoon, first examines Indian Nationalism during the post-war period, discovers its meanings and implications, and describes its salient features; then he outlines briefly the history of Christian colleges in India. Finally, he asks what effect nationalism will have upon these colleges. He believes that they do not need to cease being Christian, but must continue tolerant of every good Indian thing; they will cease to be foreign, and will turn with increasing emphasis to teach the culture indigenous to India.



CHALMERS, ROBERT S., *Privileges of the Christian Sacraments*. Morehouse, 1935, 232 pages, \$1.35.

This is Course Three in the pastoral series, books which the minister will use as the basis for teaching the Christian life and its duties to the young people in his care. In this course the minister will show what the sacraments are, how they originated, what they mean, both to the individual and to the church. It is a book which any minister, whether Episcopalian or not, will profit from reading.



EDMONDS, HENRY N., *The Way, The Truth, and the Life*. Cokesbury, 1936, 216 pages, \$1.50.

Henry Edmonds is a minister. In this book are fifteen of his sermons which deal with Christ, and with the power of life which comes from following his way. They are simply written, abound with illustrations from every day life, and are directed to men and women who feel that life has to be lived intensely and under pressure. God's way is a way of peace to those who have confidence in him.



FLEMING, A. M., *Old Father Waters*. Meadow, 1936, 350 pages, \$2.00.

A collection of twenty legends, some Indian, some American, dealing with the Mississippi River, from its rise in the northern lakes to the Louisiana delta. The author lives in Mississippi, and seems to "know his river" and the towns that border its banks. The stories are highly imaginative, of course, but highly interesting as well.



GARVIE, ALFRED E., *The Fatherly Rule of God*. Abingdon, 1935, 256 pages, \$1.25.

In a series of essays a British theologian discusses the relations between God and man. These relations should lead to the normal enrichment of man in every sphere of his life, to the great satisfaction of God. Man achieves greater self-realization in society than he would individually or in isolation, therefore society is a blessing. So, too, the larger society which becomes a nation. The same difficulties which

hinder man's development in personal relationships hinder his development in larger social groups. These difficulties Dr. Garvie canvasses thoughtfully. The answer to the problem he finds in a Christian internationalism in which all Christians shall seek God as father of all.

* * *

GOODSPEED, EDGAR J., *The Translators to the Reader*. *University of Chicago Press*, 1935, 49 pages, 50c.

The Preface to the King James Version of the Bible, which was prepared by the translators, has been omitted from practically all editions. As a result, multitudes of pious folk have developed quite erroneous ideas concerning the Bible. Dr. Goodspeed pleads with the publishers to include the Preface in printings of the Bible in order that readers may be enlightened. In the booklet are included a facsimile of the original Preface from the 1611 edition, together with the Preface modernized in spelling and use of words.

* * *

GORDON, S. D., *Prayer and the Bible*. *Revell*, 1935, 126 pages, \$1.00.

In the simple, intimate style with which he wrote his *Quiet Talks* on so many intimate aspects of religious living, Dr. Gordon has prepared this series of brief messages on *Prayer and the Bible*. Prayer is the means of bringing man into touch with the sources of all spiritual power. The Bible shows how it has been done and may still be done.

* * *

HALE, ANNIE RILEY, *The Medical Voodoo*. *Gotham House*, 1935, 338 pages, \$2.50.

The medical profession, in its search for ways to improve human health, has developed hypotheses which have grown into beliefs and current practices. Some of these have been proved correct. Others are still in the "guess-work" stage. The author vitriolically attacks these beliefs and practices, especially in the realm of immunology. Operations for cancer, for instance, "seldom cure." Vivisection is a terribly brutal and always unnecessary thing, she avers. Bitter attacks, especially when annotated with descriptions of sadism, make interesting reading. The treatment, however, is not convincing.

* * *

HAYNE, COE, *They Came Seeking*. *Judson*, 1935, 144 pages, \$1.00.

Coe Hayne knows home missions. A veteran himself, he has seen progress throughout the West and Southwest for half a century. In this rapidly moving little book he mentions one after another of the pioneers who came into the open country and helped lay the foundations for Christian civilization. Part of the story deals with the trip of a modern "covered wagon" as it traveled slowly (on automobile wheels as a trailer) over some of the pioneer trails on its way to the west.

* * *

KAGAWA, TOYOHICO, *Songs from the Slums*. *Cokesbury*, 1935, 96 pages, \$1.00.

Perhaps the most striking characteristic of Kagawa is his sensitiveness to human sorrow and misery, coupled with his longing to bring men into fellowship with God. In his earlier

years of Christian service, he wrote a number of brief poems filled with these hungers. They describe the filth and disease and human weakness with which the poor are surrounded; cry out to God for succor; and break through frequently with triumphant shouts of the discovery of God. Translated from the Japanese by Lois J. Ericson, a missionary friend, and introduced by Sherwood Eddy.

* * *

KANE, W., *An Essay Toward a History of Education*. *Loyola U. Press*, 1935, 637 pages, \$2.40.

The author, a Jesuit, has been Professor of Education at Loyola University, and now is Librarian in that institution. Beginning with primitive education, he traces human endeavor in this field down to the present. Because the book is written for use in Catholic schools, primarily, the author is not hesitant to interpret the history of education from the point of view of one who believes in divine revelation and a purposive universe. His thought is vigorous and objective. He has not refrained from calling attention to the weaknesses of many Catholic educators, nor from describing with approval the work of non-Catholics.

This reviewer, who is familiar with educational movements and thought, has found Father Kane's volume stimulating and suggestive.

* * *

MCALLISTER, F. B., *Frank Answers to Youth Questions*. *Revell*, 1935, 128 pages, \$1.25.

The questions are asked by young people, both married and unmarried. The high school students want information about their moral standards. The unemployed young man, the modern business girl, the young couple who must postpone their wedding because of economic reasons, present their problems. Those newly married have their peculiar questions arising out of the establishment of a home. Mr. McAllister gives the answers of a thoughtful and realistic observer from the background of a Christian heritage. These conversations will prove helpful to leaders of groups as well as to young people themselves.

* * *

MEYEROWITZ, ARTHUR, *Social Ethics of the Jews*. *Bloch*, 1935, 104 pages, \$1.25.

From the Hebrew Scriptures and other sacred writings the author has collated passages which summarize the principal ethical conceptions of the Jews. Jewish ethical principles are, of course, utilitarian and social, but they are, unlike modern ethical systems, deeply rooted in the belief that they reflect the will of God, the Creator and Master of the universe. Ethical conduct appears, therefore, as the essence of Jewish religion.

* * *

MULLINS, E. Y., and TRIBBLE, H. W., *The Baptist Faith*. *Sunday School Board, S. B. C.*, 1935, 124 pages, 60c.

A number of years ago the late Dr. Mullins wrote *The Axioms of Religion*. Professor Tribble has rewritten the book in simpler form, to serve as a unit in the Southern Baptist teacher training course. The axioms of religion are,

(1) The holy and loving God has a right to be sovereign, (2) All men have an equal right to access to God, (3) All believers have a right to equal privileges in the church, (4) To be responsible, the soul must be free, (5) A free church in a free state, and (6) Love your neighbor as yourself. The task is well done.

* * *

RICHARDS, LEYTON, *Realistic Pacifism. Willett, Clark*, 1935, 258 pages, \$2.00.

A British pastor has combined into one volume two small books which deal with war. The first delineates the Christian's attitude toward war, which must be one of repudiation. The second deals with the problem of war itself, its futility, its incompatibility with a world of travel and inter-dependence such as ours has become. Disarmament, international sanctions, pressure of public opinion, must be counted upon to produce peace. An international police is really all the force that is required. Mr. Richards repudiates Communism as a way out, saying that the positive method of Christianity is vastly better.

* * *

RICHARDSON, N. E., and MCLENNAN, K. S., *The Worship Committee in Action. International Society of Christian Endeavor, Boston*, 1935, 121 pages, 50c.

The "Dover Park Church" has a young people's society. Its worship committee discuss among themselves all the problems of their work, decide what young people mean by worship, what it does to people, how private devotions may help, how to plan devotional meetings, the problems of discovering leaders, the art of leading meetings, the question of variety in unity, and sources of materials for worship. The form is attractively conversational, the problems discussed are real, and the solutions are challenging.

* * *

RUSSELL, DANIEL, *Preaching the Apocalypse. Abingdon*, 1935, 254 pages, \$2.00.

Dr. Russell is an experienced New York City pastor. For years he shied away from Revelation because the book was heavy, unusual, and the haven of biblical cranks. Then he attempted to use its message as the basis for thirty consecutive Sunday sermons. The congregation appreciated it to such an extent that Dr. Russell has put the sermons, abbreviated, into print. His outlines are suggestive for ministers who would like to use the Apocalypse. Dr. Russell's theological point of view is liberal, without being radical.

* * *

SARGENT, PORTER, *The New Immoralities. Porter Sargent, Boston*, 1935, 190 pages, \$2.00.

"There is nothing wrong with the world but the people in it. And there's nothing much wrong with them except their mental attitudes. . . . It's our loving parents and conscientious teachers that have made us what we are."

Mr. Sargent believes that we need a new moral code, that it is inevitable we should have a new one, and that the mode of present life is driving us to break with past codes and establish new ones. He is not afraid of the future. He would urge more haste!

VAN KEUREN, FLOYD, *Outfitting for Spiritual Marriage. Morehouse*, 1935, 166 pages, \$1.75.

Assuming that two young people are planning marriage, what should they know that will enable them to establish a home wisely, and remain permanently and happily married? Dr. Van Keuren attempts an answer to the question in this book. It is filled with wise advice from beginning to end. Two very useful chapters offer techniques for troubled people, and the customary etiquette for weddings.

* * *

VIETH, PAUL H., *How to Teach in the Church School. Westminster*, 1935, 173 pages, 75c.

Dr. Vieth has written down his materials to the simplest possible level, in order to reach non-academic teachers in church schools. In twenty well organized and interesting chapters he covers the broad range of teaching in church schools—who and why and what we teach, the use of Bible and other lesson material, class management and method, evangelism and worship. In a final chapter he includes a teacher self-rating scale, so simply prepared that any teacher can use it.

* * *

WEATHERHEAD, LESLIE D., *Why Do Men Suffer? Abingdon*, 1935, 224 pages, \$1.25.

In a penetrating philosophical and theological study, this influential minister identifies the suffering of man with the suffering of God. "Just as I may give my boy roller skates and thus provide him with new pleasure, but also with new possibilities of suffering, so God has given me my free will, my slowly working mind, my family blessings . . . knowing that he who shares the family assets must share the family liabilities, too." God's way of living is the natural, ethical, religious way. Those who miss the mark, through ignorance, or struggle, or the inevitable conditions of life, or unwillingness to conform, must suffer.

* * *

WILLIAMS, JESSE F., *Atlas of Human Anatomy. Barnes & Noble*, 1935, 64 pages, \$2.00.

One of the briefest but most satisfactory treatments of the subject the reviewer has seen, containing twenty-eight pages of descriptive matter, and an equal number of pages of charts in color. Careful annotation of the charts, and their close integration with the reading matter, makes it possible for the thoughtful reader to follow the discussion easily.

* * *

ZELIGS, DOROTHY F., *A Child's History of the Hebrew People. Bloch*, 1935, 179 pages, \$1.25.

Miss Zeligs has written a textbook for nine and ten year old Jewish children. Beginning in a classroom in a "large city," they start on an imaginary voyage to Palestine. In six large panel epochs they study their people down to the fall of Rome. The author has followed the modern method of making history a series of thrilling episodes.

While the book contains no reference to Jesus or the Christian movement, that part could be added by a teacher who wishes to do so, and the book become useful in Christian church schools.

